

SPEECHES

DELIVERED BY

HON. EDWARD BLAKE

THE LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

AND A SYNOPSIS OF THE

DEBATE ON THE HOME RULE RESOLUTIONS

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Contents:

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND	-	-	1880
HOME RULE RESOLUTIONS	-	-	1882
THE ORANGE INCORPORATION BILL	-	-	1884
EXECUTION OF LOUIS RIEL	-	-	1886
HOME RULE DEBATE	-	-	1886

TORONTO:

PRINTED BY C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, 5 JORDAN STREET.

1886.

LP
F5012
1886
BG
C.2

1207246

THE PROPHETIC UTTERANCES OF 1880.

In the Session of 1880, Mr. Blake's solemn conviction in the justice of the agitation for Home Rule for Ireland, and his abiding faith in the great Liberal Party of England regarding with favor such a measure, found expression in the following language :—

“ I hope for great things for Ireland and the Empire from the events of the last few days. I hope and trust that the advent to power of the Liberal Party, supported by a great majority of decided Liberals and Radicals, will result in fresh measures of relief and justice to Ireland, which will tend still further to weaken her old feelings of hostility and disaffection, and to make the Empire in this regard an United Empire. I hope we shall see among other things a moderate measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and witness by the application of that measure the creation and maintenance of true and real bonds of union between Ireland and the rest of the so-called United Kingdom.”

THE IRISH QUESTION

IN THE

CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HOME RULE RESOLUTIONS, 1882: HON. MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH (CONDENSED).

On Thursday, the 20th of April, 1882, a motion was made in the House of Commons for an Address to the Queen on the subject of Irish affairs. Hon. Edward Blake, leader of the Liberal party in Canada, delivered the following speech in the course of debate :

Mr. BLAKE—If no other hon. member proposes to address the House on the subject, I do not, for my part, feel disposed to give a silent vote upon it. It is now two years ago since, in the course of a very important discussion here, I ventured to suggest in my place in Parliament that the accession to power, which had then recently taken place, of the Liberal Administration in England, would lead very shortly to the concession of some measure of Home Rule to the Irish people. I believe, as I said, that such a solution as could be obtained of the land question, such a solution as had been from time to time reached of other political questions, would, after all, not settle the Irish question, and that unless the dictates of prudence and of justice alike were observed and fulfilled by the granting to the Irish people of some measure of control over their local affairs, we would see that which has been the disgrace and the humiliation of the British Empire for many years still continued. I also stated, as the hon. gentleman in his speech and in his motion has observed, that we had one amongst many material interests here, in Canada, in the solution of that question, in the change which might be expected from it in the attitude of the great bulk of the Irish people towards the Empire, that we had a material—although I regard it as a much lesser interest than the interest which has been mainly discussed—we had a material interest of a serious character with

reference to the chances and the opportunity of immigration to our soil, which will be impaired so long as the present state of feeling shall continue. Now, I propose to justify the attitude which I took upon that occasion, and which did not then meet with any very animated response in the House or in the country ; I propose to justify it by a reference to some obvious historical facts which it appears to me can lead to only one inevitable conclusion. In order that we may understand the ground upon which, as I conceive, some action in this direction is demonstrably necessary, it is by no means needful to go further back than to the time of the Union.

THE MISRULE OF IRELAND.

It is not needful here to recur in detail to the more ancient events in connection with Irish history, to the history of the conquest, to the history of the confiscations, to the history of the proscriptions, to the history of the penal laws—directed at one time against Protestants, and at one time against Catholics—to the history of those penal laws, and of those events of the most serious and terrible description, laws and events to which I have briefly alluded, but which ought to make us all, when we recur to them, blush with shame, which have left marks of human error and of human crime, almost indelible, and enhancing, there can be no doubt, even to-day, the difficulties of the situation. I say it is needless for the purposes of this discussion that we should revert to these matters in detail, for I am willing that this question should be tried not upon the previous events, but upon the history of the past eighty years, upon the

history of the government of Ireland under the present constitution of the United Kingdom. That history begins with the Union Act—an Act secured, as we all know, by means of the basest bribery and corruption. However beneficial the public men who carried that measure may have believed it to be, I do not suppose it will be urged to-day that the end justified the means, and I have myself a strong belief that the nefarious means by which that measure was carried operated very largely to increase the difficulties of its working, and produced a state of feeling which gave it but a poor chance of being satisfactory to the people of the country which was by such means brought into more intimate connection with Great Britain. But, Sir, since that period, for a little more than eighty years has Ireland been managed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom; and I do not hesitate to say that

THE RESULT OF THAT MANAGEMENT

has been a dreadful failure. There has been time enough to try the question out. Eighty years in the history of a country, and such an eighty years as Ireland has experienced, is surely time enough to try the question out. Now, let us apply some obvious, plain and palpable tests as to whether there has been a good and successful administration of Irish affairs under the existing system. The population of Ireland in 1726 was 2,300,000; in 1805, a few years after the Union, it was 5,400,000; and that increase, more than doubling, occurred during a time of difficulty, of religious proscription, and of emigration. In 1841 the population had abnormally increased under circumstances which it is not necessary to discuss, but it had increased to the number of 8,200,000. But since 1841 the history of Ireland has been a history of periodical distress, of famine, of eviction, and of emigration, and the result is that the population, which in 1841 stood at 8,200,000, stands to-day at 5,160,000 only, or 240,000 less than eighty years ago, at the time of the Union, and 3,000,000 less than it was forty years ago. In the last thirty years, from 1851 to 1881, there has been an emigration from that country of no less than 2,750,000 souls! Now,

IT MAY BE SAID THAT IRELAND IS OVER-CROWDED.

I deny that Ireland, as a whole, is overcrowded. There are parts of Ireland in which the distribution of the population is

probably too dense; but I maintain that, judging by all the tests which we can reasonably apply to it, Ireland, as a country, is not an over-crowded country. The number of inhabitants to the square mile in France is 180; Italy, 225; Belgium, 421; Flanders, 718; England and Wales, 442; in the whole of Great Britain, 333; in Ireland, only 161. The area of Ireland is 20,325,000 acres, of which there are at present arable 13,465,000 acres, and there is an additional area easily made available for tillage of 4,000,000 acres more, making a total of land actually arable and available for tillage of 17,465,000 acres. How many acres are actually cultivated at this time? Only 5,200,000! And this is the case with respect to a country of which the soil is indubitably very fertile, which has raised in times past enormous crops, comparing favourably with the crops at the same time raised in England, of wheat, rye, barley, peas, beans, potatoes, and turnips; and no one doubts the capacity of Ireland for raising cattle. That country has very great natural advantages. It has great quantities of bog land from which is produced a very cheap fuel, and which lands, when reclaimed, are inferior to none in the world, whether as wheat or as pasture lands. It has splendid coal fields, although these are hardly used at all. It has magnificent, perhaps unequalled fisheries in regard to the quantities of fish caught, and the harbour and other facilities in connection with the industry. It is possessed of valuable mines of gypsum, gold, silver, lead, copper, and zinc. It has, besides, great facilities for manufacturing, both as regards facilities for the transport of manufactured goods, for the supply of raw material, and for the cheapness of the labour to be employed. It has, moreover, great abundance of splendid water-power, facilitating the manufacture of the raw material into the perfected article. It is inhabited by a people confessedly very free from crime of the ordinary kind; a people which, whatever their prospects and chances and capacities may have been demonstrated to be in their own country, have shown in every other country than Ireland that they possess the capacity to rise, and, by their industry, their ability, and their force of character, to take their own place and rank in the world, wherever their lot may be cast. They are also a people confessedly of a nature kindly, affectionate, gentle, and grateful; and possessing, in a large degree, the organ of veneration, they are easily impressed by any act of kindness shown towards them.

WHY HAS POPULATION DIMINISHED?

With such a people, with such a soil, with such natural advantages, how does it come that we have such a result, with respect to population as I have mentioned? How does it come to pass that the population of Ireland should have diminished instead of increased, that the emigration should have been so great, and that the condition of the country should be such as we know it to be? To what is due the chronically wretched state of Ireland—its miseries, social, material and political? Although there may be, although there has been, as we all rejoice to know, some improvement in the physical condition of some portion of the population during the last few years, that remains to-day a pressing question, and no man holds that the condition of Ireland is satisfactory when viewed in any of those aspects to which I have referred. The condition of the people materially, as well as in other respects, is one which ought to create in all of us who call ourselves British subjects a feeling of shame. I say that the condition of Ireland to-day is due largely to the want of security and contentment, to the want of identification with the soil and of attachment to the Constitution, to the want of that hope of improvement and of bettering their condition, which is really the most essential thing to induce men to labour. I say that it is due to a feeling that their grievances are not redressed, to the lack of a belief that their government is conducted according to their needs and wishes, and to the want of any machinery for the local management of their local affairs. There can be no doubt that Ireland, at and before the time of the Union, was subject to some great political grievances. There can be no doubt that those grievances were not of a sentimental character, but were such as are to-day acknowledged to be wrongs which demanded the attention of legislators, and should have been redressed by legislation.

THE PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND.

If you go back to the history of the parliamentary government of Ireland for the last eighty years, and if you begin your enquiry by reference to those great and important landmarks or grievances, and proceed to enquire as to the time when, and the circumstances under which, those grievances have been, so far as they have been, redressed, you will find a very good reason there, if you seek no further, for a deep-seated and justifiable

dissatisfaction as to the parliamentary government of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There was the great question—at that time as much as at any later time a question of justice and of right—of Roman Catholic emancipation. There was the question—at that time as much as a question of justice and of right as at any later time—of the disestablishment and disendowment of the State or dominant Church of the minority. There was the question—a question which we should here, in a happier land, call a lamentable question, but still in the condition of the country none the less a pressing question—of a proper measure for the relief of the poor, required because of the unnatural conditions that ruled the distribution of the land. There was the question of

REFORM OF THE LAND LAWS,

by the creation of a proper interest in the soil by those who occupied the soil. There was the question of creating local institutions to manage local affairs, rendered all the more important because of the abrogation of the rights of the Parliament of Ireland and the transfer to Westminster of the management of those minor affairs which, up to that time, were under the control of the Legislature which sat in the capital city of Ireland. These leading questions, to which I have referred, have been in part—all but the last one, which has never been substantially dealt with—disposed of, and it may be asked, since such is the fact, Why do I refer to them? I refer to them because I see that the circumstances under which, and the time at which those questions were dealt with, demonstrate more clearly than anything else can do the unsatisfactory character of the government of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. When was the question of Roman Catholic emancipation dealt with? It was not dealt with until nearly thirty years after the time of the Union. Thirty years is about a generation, and it required about a generation for the Parliament of the United Kingdom to nerve itself to the task of dealing with that question. And how was it even then granted? Was it granted then as the boon of a cheerful giver? No, Sir. It was granted grudgingly and of necessity. It was granted, avowedly granted by the Ministry, because

THEY WERE FORCED TO DO IT,

not because it was just; for they had been proclaiming to the ends of the earth that it

was not just. Not because it was right, for they had been proclaiming that it was wrong. It was granted because, as they themselves stated in Parliament, the question was between granting that concession and civil war. Things had come to such a pass that there was to be an immediate outbreak, a civil war, unless Roman Catholic emancipation was granted. Well, Sir, did that do good? Of course you could not remove, even under such circumstances, a monstrous injustice of that description without some good being done; but I say the good was minimized by the delay which took place, and by the attitude assumed by those who received and by those who gave that concession. The Irish people were taught that dreadful lesson, so far as the administration of the Parliament of the United Kingdom could teach it to them, that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. They were taught this by the delay, and by the disposition with, and the compulsion on which those Ministers acceded to the grant. They were taught to rely not upon that constitutional agitation which is the proud basis of our system, and in which every one is free to engage, but upon other and worse methods of accomplishing reforms, upon unconstitutional proceedings approaching to revolt. I say that no doubt something was done by the removal, even under those circumstances, of

THAT GREAT BLEMISH,

yet nothing was done toward improving or conciliating the feeling of the Irish people, towards leading them to believe that they had a right to expect from the unconstrained sense of justice of the British Parliament the relief to which they had a right; or towards obtaining those golden fruits which might have been reaped from a great act of justice cheerfully performed, in good season. The next measures of relief for Ireland—and I am dealing now only with the remedial legislation—I am dealing only with those measures to which the English Parliament may point with the greatest pride as monuments of its parliamentary government of Ireland—the next great measures of remedial legislation occurred, how long after? Nearly twenty years after. It was not until nearly twenty years had elapsed that we had the measure for the relief of the poor to which I have referred, followed shortly by, and intended at the time to be followed as soon as possible by, the Act for the sale of encumbered estates. The years 1846 and 1849 are, I think, the years in which those two

measures were passed; one nearly twenty years after the Emancipation Bill, and the other a few years later. These Acts, as I have said, did not deal with matters of a late date, they were not the offspring of fresh occurrences recently developed. They were the attempt by the Parliament of the United Kingdom to deal with old and long-standing difficulties, and how again was it that they were brought about? How was it that the public opinion of the British people and the opinion of the Parliament of the United Kingdom was aroused to action, such action as was then taken in these two particulars? Sir, it was not the hand of the insurgent upon that occasion, it was not the hand of the agitator, so much as

THE HAND OF SUFFERING OF FAMINE,

and of pestilence. It was not until the direst calamity which has beset the modern Christian world came upon us, and until a famine took place in which more human lives were lost than in all the wars with which England has reddened the soil of Europe and the world, it was not until that had happened, that the public opinion to which I have referred was sufficiently aroused to deal with this question. Such was the unhappy condition of Ireland at that time, and the measure passed for the relief of the poor was a great boon to them, though productive later on of some unforeseen and unfortunate results. The Encumbered Estates Act, too, was greatly needed for the relief of landlords, mortgagees, and creditors. It was hoped, however, that that Act would have had an indirect effect very beneficial to the tenants, but that hope failed. The conditions of tenants on the whole was not mitigated by the practical operation of the Act, because it happened that the sales of many of the lands under the Encumbered Estates Act were made to persons entirely new to the country, and who, in a great many instances, were wholly neglectful and defiant of those customary—I cannot call them rights—but those customary favours which were granted by the former proprietors to the tenants; and thus the system of rack-renting, and the other difficulties which might naturally be expected to grow from such an unnatural system as existed, were aggravated and intensified by the new proprietary; and so it happened that the demand for tenant right became—pressing as it was before—became still more pressing by reason of the practical operation of the Encumbered Estates Act. Well, Sir, about twenty years more elapsed before the next

great remedial measure for Ireland was carried through the British Parliament. It was, I think, in 1869 that the law for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church was passed, nearly fifty years after the Union took place. Now, who can pretend that that act of justice was not as much an act of justice at the time of the Union as it was at the date at which it became law? The principles on which the disestablishment was carried are immutable and eternal, and the question had been raised, as we all know, generations before. Public men in advance of the public opinion of the United Kingdom and of Parliament—intelligent men, statesmen, had raised it, had pointed out that it was impossible that that establishment could be defended and maintained—had proposed that an act of justice should be performed, but it was utterly impossible to make progress in that direction. An old, old grievance, a grievance so old as to be almost out of date, a grievance of the most pressing character—how, I ask, was the redress of that grievance obtained? Now, Sir, I shall give you an authentic account of how it came that Parliament and the people of the United Kingdom at length decided to

REMOVE THAT ANCIENT GRIEVANCE.

I shall give you the account which the author of that great measure for Ireland himself gave in 1878, in the Mid-Lothian campaign. These are the words Mr. Gladstone used in explaining how it came about that the Irish Church was in 1869 disestablished and disendowed:

“Down to the year 1865, and the dissolution of that year, the whole question of the Irish Church was dead. Nobody cared for it. Nobody paid any attention to it in England. Then circumstances occurred which drew the attention of the people to the Irish Church. I said myself in 1865, and I believed, that it was out of the range of practical politics—that is, the politics of the coming elections.”

Now, what was it that brought it within the range of practical politics? What was it made it possible to carry that measure of reform? Some new events, some new chain of reasoning that led to conviction on the part of the people that it was a just measure? I will read you what it was:

“When it came to this, that a great gaol in the heart of the metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the state of Ireland; and when in Manchester policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics.”

That—that is the reason by which the people and politicians of the United Kingdom were led to the belief that this great question had come within the range of practical politics, and were led to see what was their duty to the people of Ireland. Once again there was the same moving cause of the remedy; once again there was the same long, heart-breaking delay; and once again English and Scotch opinion would not act until compelled to do so. Once again, therefore, there was no need of grace in the measure so obtained. It was forced from the British Parliament and was so acknowledged, and therefore while it did remove the grievance, it did not—as timely and cheerful legislation would have done—as action based on considerations of justice would have done—contain the element of grace, and so it did not excite a feeling of gratitude in the hearts of those to whom the benefit was granted. Sir, that measure was a great measure in two distinct aspects. First of all, it destroyed the pre-eminence of the Church of the minority. It removed a crying injustice; it changed a condition which had combined the religion of the majority with their patriotism—a patriotism which, so long as it was the policy of the Parliament and people of the United Kingdom to maintain the dominance of the Church of the minority, was necessarily an anti-national patriotism. Besides that, there was the material gain that Irish funds, to the amount of many millions, were set free for legitimate and proper Irish purposes, not denominational, not sectarian, not for the minority, not for the majority, but for the whole people. Besides all these direct results of the

DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT

of the Irish Church, it had an indirect effect hardly less important. It was the first practical measure for giving to the occupiers of the soil a real and tangible interest in the soil, and for increasing the number of Irish proprietors. The just provision which gave to the tenants on Church lands the pre-emptive right to purchase those lands on moderate terms, a very small sum being payable down, and the residue being spread over instalments for thirty-two years, compounding principal and interest at a low rate, which made the annual payment not materially more than the accustomed rent, gave the tenants of Church lands an opportunity, of which they gladly availed themselves, to become the owners of the lands they occupied. And thus it added no less than 5,000 to the number

of Irish proprietors of the soil. With our notions, having regard to the figures I have given as to the population, you may say that 5,000 Irish proprietors is a trifle. What is the use of saying so much about 5,000 more Irish proprietors? I admit that it is a drop in the bucket, but then the bucket had very little more than a drop or two in it at the time. The

TOTAL NUMBER OF IRISH PROPRIETORS

at that time was about 16,000; so that this act in its operation added no less than 5,000, or very nearly one-third, to the number of Irish proprietors; and a measure which had such an effect cannot but be regarded as a very important measure of relief. This touches the core of the Irish question—the *land*. Now, Sir, Ireland is a country of small agricultural holdings, and in considering this question we must not forget that circumstance. There are in Ireland no less than 533,000 distinct farm tenancies, of which no less than 450,000 are under 50 acres, and no less than 50,000 more are between 50 and 100 acres, showing that the great bulk are under fifty acres, and as many as 500,000 out of the total 533,000 are under 100 acres. Although there are exceptions, as we know, principally in one of the provinces of Ireland, but also in the case of many estates scattered through other parts of that country, yet the bulk of these 533,000 holdings are yearly, and they are yearly in a country in which the custom has been that the tenant shall make the improvements, a custom which is wholly incompatible with the conditions of yearly tenancy. Now, Sir, while that is

THE NUMBER OF IRISH FARM TENANCIES,

let us see to what extent the separate ownership of farm lands prevails. In Ireland, one in every 257 persons owns farm lands, while in France one in every eight persons owns farm lands. In Central and Northern Europe the tenure of land is widely diffused; and while we have seen a very gradual growth and a very imperfect development, in the continental countries of Europe of the principles of popular and responsible government—while in that regard they are far behind the United Kingdom, yet we have seen, since the days of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic age, large advances made—much larger advances than have been ever dreamed of in England towards the diffusion of the tenure of land, and the abolition of that most objectionable portion of the feudal system.

In the Rhine Provinces, including Westphalia, there are 11,000,000 acres of cultivable land—and how many proprietors? 1,157,000 proprietors, or one to every ten acres of land; and if you read the history of the contentment and comfort, the work and labour, the energy and industry—the indomitable industry—that is displayed in many of these countries by the proprietors of these small areas, you must be convinced that the only thing that enables the Government of these countries to be carried on at all, burdened as they are with heavy taxes and enormous expenses, with an imperfect development of constitutional government, with great military armaments, and with an oppressive system of conscription and military service—the only thing that gives the people heart and hope, and enables them to struggle on at all, is that wide diffusion of the ownership of land than which there is nothing better calculated to promote the stability of the people to whom the land belongs. Take the State of New York, in which there are 22,200,000 acres of farm lands, and in which the holdings are large, as is natural in a new country, where there is so much land undisposed of as there is on this continent. There the owners of the land, in 1870, were 216,000, against 21,000 in Ireland, including the owners of Church lands. Look at two portions of Ireland, which may be selected as examples: take the agricultural counties of Meath, Westmeath and Cavan, which comprise 1,360,000 acres, and in which there are only 612 owners of less than 50 acres each in the whole district. Take again the mountainous districts of Galway and Mayo, containing 2,760,000 acres, and there are only 225 owners of less than 50 acres each.

THE NUMBER OF SMALL OWNERS

is insignificant in England, but that number is computed to be about ten times as large in proportion as the number is in Ireland, and that in a country of which I believe the greatest practical blemish to-day is its bad land laws. I believe there can be no doubt that the greatest practical blemish in England and Scotland to-day is the condition of the ownership of land; but even in England that difficulty is insignificant relatively to the condition of things in Ireland. Now, Sir, there can be no doubt that the old penal laws, which, among other relics of barbarity, prohibited for a long time Roman Catholics either from owning or inheriting lands, had much to do with the creation of the present state of things as to land-holding in Ireland,

and that state of things being once created and marked deeply upon the country, it becomes of course proportionably difficult to obliterate it.

THE RESULT WAS A PRACTICAL SERFDOM ;

the people who cultivated the lands were only left enough to subsist on in a miserable manner. All concede that there were many landlords in Ireland who granted proper leases, and behaved with propriety towards their tenantry ; yet in the main, and subject to these exceptions, the practical result was that the whole profit of the lands, with the exception of a poor, miserable subsistence to the tenant who worked them, went to the landlord ; and the further result was, that where improvements were made an early opportunity was taken to increase the rental of the lands to the extent to which they had become capable of increased production, by virtue of the improvements which the tenant and his family had made. This was a state, of things which of course did not merely diminish, but destroyed, that hope of bettering himself which is the spur by which you can expect to urge men to rise, and under the influence of which you can expect happiness and contentment to be diffused. The first or one of the earliest writers on the subject of land-holding—Young, I think—says : “ Give a man a nine years’ lease of a garden, and he will turn it into a desert ; give him a freehold of the naked rock, and in nine years he will turn it into a garden ; ” and I believe that not untruly represents, in a general sense, the relative condition of things between the short holder under the customs that prevail in Ireland, and the proprietor who occupies the land. Now, that situation would have been bad enough if the rents so exacted from the tenantry were rents in any proper sense of the term ; but the

WHOLE PRODUCE OF THE SOIL WENT ELSEWHERE

beyond a sum enough, not to enable the unfortunate people to clothe themselves, but to live in rags—not to feed themselves, but to keep starvation from them. Beyond that sum, the whole of the produce of the soil was taken by the landlords, and, worse again, by landlords who, as a rule, did not live in the country, because a certain measure of improvement and prosperity would necessarily have arisen from the expenditure on the soil of those enormous rents. But to make a condition miserable enough, God knows, without it, still more miserable, the bulk

of those who received these rents were absentee landlords ; and so it happened that speaking once again in the main, not merely a fair share and proportion of the produce of the soil, but the whole produce of the soil of Ireland, with but wretched livings for those who raised it, went away from Ireland—was rather a tribute paid by Ireland to foreign countries, than legitimately applied within the land itself—an application which would have occasioned the development of trade and manufactures, which would have given more employment, agriculturally as well as otherwise, and produced some mitigating circumstances at any rate to relieve the darkness of the picture to which I referred. I say it happened there was

LUXURY FOR THE ABSENTEE LANDLORD,

misery for the resident tenant, as the rule, and that too in a country of which it has been said, not that I believe rhetorically, but in a sober truth, that if you wiped out the tenants’ improvements you would convert nine-tenths of Ireland into a desert again. I have said enough to show that the question of the land is the core of the Irish question, and to show how great was the importance of any measure, such as the Irish Church Act, which should have tended even in a moderate degree to unite the diverse interests of the occupant and of the land he occupied, and to create a landed proprietary in Ireland. That measure was followed within a year or two by the Land Act of 1870, an Act which was no doubt, a useful Act, and which was, probably, in effect I have no doubt, quite as strong and sweeping a measure as the public opinion to which I have referred of the people of the United Kingdom would suffer to be passed at that day, but which, in consequence of that public opinion not being sufficiently appreciative of the situation, was far behind what the necessities of the situation called for. Now, both

THE CHURCH AND THE LAND ACT

were brought about, not from a sense of the justice of either or both measures—were brought within the domain of practical politics, not because interested or selfish landlords or wealthy men had come to the conclusion, from some new turn of reasoning, that the condition of Ireland was one of injustice, and of misery that required amelioration, but because a great gaol in the heart of London was broken open, and some policemen in Manchester were killed. That it was this that aroused England’s attention to Irish af-

fairs, and rendered possible those measures of reform, is beyond doubt. Once again the same fatal error—once again justice and measures of propriety and prudence were too long delayed, and once again were those lessons taught the Irish people which bore for so many years such fatal fruits. That Land Act was useful in its way, but it was not wide enough; the land clauses known as Bright's, most hopeful in theory, which struck directly at the root of the question, turned out in practice not so useful as the land clauses with reference to the Irish Church, owing to differences of condition. The truth was, that in other respects

THE LAND LAWS OF IRELAND

as of England and Scotland, were grievously defective, and the expense of a voluntary transfer of land in small parcels was almost prohibitory. The search for titles, and copies and conveyances, and conveyancing itself, were so costly that whatever price you might fix for those moderate portions of land, which were the utmost aspiration of the occupant, would in many cases fail to meet the expenses of conveyancing. That was one difficulty with which the legislation was unable to grapple. There was another, in the want of sympathy on the part of the Treasury and other Departments of the Government with those clauses which savoured a little too much, in the then public opinion of the country, of interference with the sacred property in land—which looked a little too much towards a denial of the

DIVINE RIGHT OF LANDLORDISM,

which looked a little too much like a practical recognition of the motto that property has its duties as well as its rights; and so it happened in practice that there were but 100 sales a year on the average, or a total of 800, by the last return I have been able to obtain, under the provisions of the land clauses of the Act of 1870. So, therefore, you will observe that the Act was defective as a remedy for the evils complained of, and, by experience, was proved to be wholly inadequate. Then, in 1880, the last Land Act was passed, under continual pressure—under similar pressure, increased and aggravated by events; a great measure, but by itself not likely, finally, to settle the great question. I will not discuss the complicated details of that measure; but I will say that a measure which is based upon the ground and founded upon the reason upon which that measure depends, and which makes no provision at all for dealing with cases of arrears of rents,

cannot be regarded as a final or satisfactory measure, if there were no other defect. If you look at the history of the ills which preceded that measure, and at the circumstances of the country, as stated by its authors, you will see that such a measure must be to a large extent wholly inadequate, and entirely beyond practical application towards many of the most grievous cases that can be supposed to exist under it, unless it deals with arrears for some time back. The most grievous cases will be those of parties unable to pay their rents. However, no one can doubt but that that measure was

AN IMMENSE ACT OF RELIEF,

that it was a measure that gave more than was expected by many, or was thought possible to be obtained from the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and nobody can doubt either that it was obtained from that Parliament only by continued difficulties. The state of Ireland, as it had been, was becoming more aggravated still. Things were growing worse and worse before the adoption of the last remedial measure, and the conviction at length impressed itself on the United Kingdom that something more must be done to remedy those evils. But the same fatal errors which attended the agitation for the introduction of the previous remedial measures attended this. It came so late that a large portion of the benefit was lost, so far as feeling was concerned, and so far as the conviction might have been created that Ireland could depend on the justice of the Parliament of the United Kingdom for any prospect of an ending to its sufferings. In these respects this last remedial measure had wholly lost its grace. I say it is as plain as the day that true statesmanship pointed to earlier action—to action under other and different circumstances, when a measure, even less thoroughgoing than this one, would have produced an amelioration in the condition and temper of the people of that country much greater than could be expected from the measure brought in and carried at the time, under the circumstances and under the pressure which attended its becoming law. That is

THE RECORD OF EIGHTY YEARS

of remedial legislation for Ireland. These are the important landmarks—the great acts for the remedy of wrongs, and the chief grants of justice that have distinguished British legislation for Ireland in the past eighty years. There are others, no doubt, subsidiary acts. It did not take quite so

long—I forget whether more than a couple of Parliaments—to induce the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass a Sunday Closing Act, which was demanded by the unanimous voice of the Irish population, and was applicable to them only, but which did not agree with the sentiments of the British publican, and which, therefore, it was thought wrong to give to the Irish people. But it came at last, and minor measures of this description have come to Ireland from time to time; but the large and important measures of statesmanship which have agitated the public mind are those to which I have referred, and these have been accomplished only after the delays and under the circumstances I have briefly stated. Can anybody wonder then that there should have grown up early, and that there should continue with an ever-increasing volume and urgency,

A CRY FOR A MEASURE OF HOME RULE?

Put the question to ourselves. If we had been for eighty years in the position that these people have been in for that time; if we had had to agitate for a whole generation for one measure of justice, for three-quarters of a generation for the next measure, and two-thirds of a generation for the third; if as each of these measures had been obtained, it was seen to be due, not to the recognition of the justice of our cause, but to the recognition of the danger of further delay, what would have been our feelings, and how earnestly would we have demanded some portion of control over our affairs? But there is a darker side to the picture than this. While remedies were refused, force was at the same time constantly applied. While you have the miserable record of remedial Acts to which I have referred, you have the still more miserable record of Arms Acts, Coercion Acts, Restraint of the Press Acts, Suspension of Habeas Corpus Acts, and all those legislative means of restraining the people passed from time to time with the utmost freedom by the same Parliament which was denying and delaying what is now admitted to have been only justice to that people. I do not mean to say that the conduct of the Irish people—a large portion of it—under these circumstances was justifiable. Far from it. I do not mean to say that it may not have been necessary sometimes to pass these Acts.

TRUE FRIENDS OF IRELAND

have from time to time concurred in their passage. But I do mean to say that the

condition of things enduring for eighty years, with such a record on its brighter side of remedial legislation and such a record on its darker side of coercive legislation, affords absolute proof that the experiment of local government for Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom has been a disastrous failure. Besides legislative coercion, there were other methods of coercion employed. There is an army, under the guise of a constabulary, of 12,000 or 13,000 of, I suppose, the best troops in the world, the Irish constabulary; and we have had from time to time large portions of the military forces of the Empire quartered in Ireland. From time to time not less than 50,000 men—I believe to-day not less than 50,000 men of the British army—are stationed in Ireland to keep the people down, and large detachments of the British fleet frequent Irish harbours for the same purpose. Whether right or wrong in this controversy, it cannot be contended that the government of Ireland for eighty years has been a government by constitutional means, but it must be admitted that it has been a government by force. That is, in the large, the result of the whole business. Now at length it is acknowledged—as the hon. member for Victoria has said, freely and frankly acknowledged—that Ireland was being misgoverned all those years.

WHAT A HUMILIATING POSITION

is that which the mother of Parliaments, the mother of constitutional freedom throughout the world, occupies on this question! Which of us did not feel with a pang of humiliation the keen shaft of the satirist who not long since forged, so to speak, the letter from the Sultan of Turkey, calling, in response to some calls that had been made by England on him to remedy some grievances of his subjects—calling on the British Government to remedy the condition of the Irish people? Who did not feel that such a letter might have been fairly written, that such a complaint might have been fairly made, and that the argument so often urged in this House of *tu quoque* might have been fairly used? Of the dreadful results of all this it is needless to speak. No doubt Ireland is largely in a state of anarchy, ruled, as far as the United Kingdom is concerned, mainly by force, and so far as a large portion of the people is concerned, mainly by organizations without and beyond the control of the law; and I maintain that it is the delays which have taken place in their passage, and the circumstances

under which these measures of pressing justice and importance have been at length granted, which are largely responsible for the distressed condition of that country.

THERE WERE TWO REASONS FOR THESE DELAYS:

Reformers—and I do not use the word in a party sense, or as defining wholesale the Reform party of Britain, as compared with the Conservative party, though I might so use it; but still there have been honourable exceptions in the Conservative party—Reformers, in the larger sense of the term, have from time to time pressed upon the public and upon Parliament, long before these reforms were granted, their justice and necessity; but the great body of public opinion was unquestionably hostile to Irish reform. In a Parliament of the United Kingdom, in which, under our constitutional system, the opinion of the majority must rule, it was impossible that considerations of justice or expediency to which the majority were not alive could be recognized in time. I believe that long ago many of these measures would have been attempted by far-sighted statesmen, except that they felt it was impossible to carry them, except that they were, as Mr. Gladstone has put it, beyond the realm of practical politics, because the aristocratic interest, the large land-holding interest, the Conservative interest, and many other interests were hostile and entirely too strong to allow the relatively small band of advanced Reformers to carry them into effect in due season. In a word, the public opinion of the United Kingdom did not recognize the importance of the subject, and was not sufficiently advanced to discharge the duty of efficiently managing Irish affairs. The second difficulty was the want of time. Parliament has been overweighted with its multitudinous concerns; it has had to deal with

LARGE IMPERIAL CONCERNS,

it has had to deal with local concerns which were supposed to be more pressing, and it has been unequal to its task. We know that for a great many years Parliament has been unequal to its task in this regard. We know that measures have been brought in by strong Governments session after session, and have been just crushed out by the pressure of other affairs—have not even reached the stage of effective discussion. It takes years, as a rule, before that which is deemed sufficiently ripe for legislation to be actually brought into Parliament by a Government

on its responsibility can reach that stage of discussion unless there be some extraordinary reason of urgency such as has lately attended the Irish question. It has thus happened that men have been too apt to say with reference to the large questions to which I have referred, and which have come up for settlement: "Oh, that question is not yet within the range of practical politics," just as Mr. Gladstone said on the Irish question in 1865; and so they say of these questions until gunpowder, murder, assassination, explosions, a condition of chronic disaffection breaking out with peculiar violence in some particular manner, bring them to the conclusion forthwith that the question is

WITHIN THE RANGE OF PRACTICAL POLITICS,

and has got to be dealt with. Now, I say that even if Parliament would even now take up what it ought long ago to have taken up, the question of local government for Ireland, we might hope it would be dealt with in time to do good; but it also may, and I fear will, be dealt with so late as to obviate all chance of its settlement being productive of better feeling between the people of the two countries, and thus it is that I am brought to the conclusion that it is the duty of every man who entertains a strong feeling for the empire, who entertains a feeling of pride in its glories and of shame in its failures and its faults, to do what he can in his sphere towards pressing forward this Irish question to a solution while there yet be time. Now, so long ago as 1878 the statesman to whom I referred a while ago, Mr. Gladstone, spoke in this manner prior to the general election which took place at that time:

"In the matter of Local Government there may be a solution of some national and even imperial difficulties. . . . I am friendly to local government, I am friendly to large local privileges and power, and I desire—I may almost say, I intensely desire—to see Parliament relieved of some portion of its duties. We have got an overweighted Parliament, and if Ireland or any other portion of the country is desirous and able to arrange its affairs, that by taking the local part or part of its transactions off the hands of Parliament it can liberate and strengthen Parliament for Imperial concerns, I say I will not only accord a reluctant assent, but I will give a generous support to any such scheme."

I think, Sir, having regard to that speech, I was justified in hailing the accession to power of the Liberal party, as I did in the year 1880, as being an omen of some measure of redress for Ireland in this particular. But, Sir, another speech was delivered by that

same statesman, under the responsibility of office, in the Imperial House of Commons, not very long ago, in which he once again recurred to this subject, and said :

"We attach great value," said Mr. Gladstone, "to the extension—perhaps I should say to the establishment—(hear, hear)—of the principles of local government in Ireland. We believe that one of the great evils under which Ireland labours is the want of local administration, and a more central system of authority. We believe that the state of Ireland never can be satisfactory until the people have acquired and learned by tradition and practice to exercise those powers of local government which were so beneficial in other portions of the Empire. Moreover, we believe that where the Irish people had the opportunity within a limited range of giving proof of their powers and qualities and capabilities for local government, as they have done under the Poor Law Acts, and through some other channels, they have administered well. Indeed no one can doubt that, or their perfect capacity for such a duty. But this is speaking on the question of purely local administration. The motion of my honourable friend embraces matters of wider scope. I wish to point out to those honourable gentlemen that neither they, nor so far as I know Mr. Butt before them, nor so far as I know Mr. O'Connell before him, ever distinctly explained in an intelligent and practical form the manner in which the real knot of this question was to be untied. The principle on which they profess to proceed is, that purely Irish matters to be dealt with by a purely Irish authority, Imperial matters to be left to the Imperial authority of a Chamber in which Ireland is to be represented. But they have not told us by what authority it is to be determined which matters, taken one by one, are Irish, and which matters are Imperial."

Sir, in that speech, while announcing once again his adhesion to the principle of local government, that great statesman endeavoured to shift from the shoulders of the responsible Government of the Empire to the shoulders of those who are in a hopeless minority a question which it belongs to that Government to solve. I say that it belongs to those who are responsible for the good government of the Empire, who have the majority, who have the power, who can initiate legislation themselves,

TO GRAPPLE WITH THE DIFFICULTY.

I say to those who admit that the present system is unjust, who admit that the present condition of Ireland cannot be satisfactory without some change, who acknowledge that a change can and ought to be made, are in an untenable position when they tell the minority: "Gentlemen, come forward, propound some plan, solve every difficulty, tell us how you would settle this question, and until you do that we are not called upon to act." That is not, in my opinion, language worthy of any statesman, be he Conservative or Reformer.

It is not upon such a system that the Irish question can be settled. It would be folly to blink the consideration that any measure that Mr. Gladstone may propose on this question might be unsatisfactory to many, and at any rate would not be accepted by all the Irish people as a final settlement of the question. But I maintain that the longer you delay, the greater the difficulties; and I assert that though the proposition you are able to propose may not be satisfactory to all, that is no ground whatever for declining to do that which you yourself acknowledge it is just should be done. True justice will be that which is right, and will give that measure of relief which it knows is proper, and thus will result that added measure of safety and security which should flow from the changed state of affairs, when many reasonable men, now complaining, shall be enlisted by the concession on the side of order. What is the present state of affairs? The Prime Minister of England says the condition of Ireland is unsatisfactory, because the Irish people have not the measure of local government which they ought to have, and he says: "I will not give that measure of local government to you; I will not stir hand or foot in the matter until the Irish members in the House of Commons, who are in the minority, and are powerless to do anything, shall propose a measure which shall be satisfactory to themselves and to me, and I call on them to undertake to deal with this complicated and exacerbated question, so full of difficulties growing out of all the errors and circumstances of the past." I will not engage in a discussion of the various hypothetical cases and somewhat strained difficulties which it seems to me are suggested in Mr. Gladstone's speech. I frankly admit that the division of power between the local and federal authorities is one of them, and a very serious one; but how there can be a difficulty in deciding the mode by which that is to be regulated, in determining that it is to be regulated by the Act of Parliament which creates the new system, I cannot at all see. There can be no doubt whatever that the real difficulty which occurred to the Prime Minister on this occasion was the same which he has entertained and expressed so freely—was that same difficulty which has prevented justice being done to Ireland in former years and under other circumstances; it was the difficulty of having to deal with a recalcitrant and inert mass of public opinion, not sufficiently advanced to enable him to grapple with the subject. To him I believe the words of the great poet

of the adjoining Republic apply when he says :

"His statecraft was the golden rule,
His right of vote a sacred trust;
Clear above threat and ridicule,
All heard his challenge, 'Is it just?'"

I believe that a love of justice and of generous and liberal treatment is an instinct, I might say, of that statesman's nature; but he must be sustained, his hands must be held up, in order to give him the power to accomplish the task which, though advanced in years, it remains for him to do in order to crown a noble life spent in the service of his country. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. Costigan) said that

SCOTLAND WAS ALSO MOVING

on the subject. Within the last few days a very important meeting has been held, which came to the conclusion to ask for a Local Legislature for Scotland, with triennial elective Parliaments; and there can be no doubt that, notwithstanding the remarkable business tact and talent by which the Scotch business has been managed in Parliament, there have been great and injurious defects and delays in the management of that business. What has been accomplished by a sort of imperfect federation in that regard? We know that, in regard to all Scotch parliamentary measures, the Scotch members have met together and agreed as to what was wanted for their country, and what was agreed upon has generally been passed through Parliament, unless it trenched upon the prejudices and views of others, almost without debate. They have not succeeded in all things; they have not succeeded in many important things. They have had strong fights when questions came up which involved, by analogy, interests in other parts of the United Kingdom; but they have done much, and this agitation in Scotland, where they have so much less to complain of than in Ireland, cannot fail to have an important influence in maturing public opinion on the Irish question. I maintain that the English Parliament cannot deal efficiently with these questions; that as well from lack of knowledge and sympathy, as in consequence of being, as Mr. Gladstone has said, wholly overweighed with work, it is not competent, and its incompetency has been proved and confessed by the present Premier, to deal satisfactorily with these questions. Let the British people then give to the Irish people.

THIS LEGITIMATE VENT

for their somewhat restless energies, and utilize them in the legitimate occupation of dealing with their own concerns. I have once again to trouble the House with another extract from a still later speech by Mr. Gladstone. Speaking in Parliament, that gentleman said only the other day :

"Sir, this is a subject on which I have very distinct and clear opinions, which I have never scrupled to declare. They are not shared by many gentlemen; probably in this House they may be considered of a speculative character, and it is highly unlikely that I shall ever be called upon to take a practical part in any matter relating to these opinions; but I have the very strongest opinions upon the advantages of local government, and I have the strongest objections to the tendency which I see constantly prevailing to centralization. Not for Ireland merely, but for England, I would take and profess it at all points a cardinal rule of policy, so far as I can with safety to the general structure of the Empire, to decentralize Parliament."

Now, Sir, I have read that speech for two or three reasons. First of all, because you will observe that the Prime Minister, after an interval of reflection, comment and criticism, reiterates the demand, as an essential condition preliminary to any action on this subject, that a satisfactory solution of all these difficulties should be propounded by those who ask for it on the Home Rule benches. Therefore we find the suggestion that it should stand until a day which may never come. Secondly, there is the repetition of a declaration which he says he has made for ten years, and therefore we find no advance in his views upon this question. Lastly and most important, we find him using those same fatal words under colour of which Irish questions, as I have proved, have been always postponed until the day of grace and greatest utility has passed. "This is not a practical question. I do not expect to be called upon to deal with it." I cannot agree with this view. I say it is a practical, a burning question. It is the most practical and burning question we can conceive; and when the Minister has stated that the results are not satisfactory as they stand, that there ought to be a change, that there ought to be a grant of local rights and privileges, that justice demands it, and that it cannot be expected that the Irish people will be satisfied unless the Parliament of the United Kingdom discharges that duty, then, I say, justice demands that those who have the power and the responsibility should propound that legislation. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of

ANOTHER BRANCH OF THIS QUESTION.

and that is whether we have any interest in this question calling upon us to interfere in it; and I deal with that branch of the question now, partly because the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, and partly because it is not the first occasion on which a great Irish question has come under the consideration of this House and has been treated by this House in one way or another. I alluded a while ago to the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as one of vast importance both in its direct and indirect relations to the condition of Ireland, and it happened while that question was under debate in the old land a late respected member of this House, the Hon. Mr. Holton, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, moved on the 31st of May, 1869, an Address to the Queen stating the opinion of this House. To this the hon. gentleman, the present Prime Minister moved, seconded by Sir George Cartier, the previous question, and the previous question was upon that occasion carried by the hon. gentleman with the assistance of his supporters, against the vote of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman supported his motion for the previous question by a speech, in which he objected to the proposed action, to which speech I refer. Now, Sir, I maintain that the hon. gentleman was on that occasion mistaken as to the real feelings and sentiments of the great majority of the Canadian people. I believe that so far from that motion being, as the hon. gentleman said, calculated to excite discord, heart-burnings and religious difficulties, we would have all agreed—had he himself but seen the question in another light—in favour of the proposed solution of that question, just as we had agreed in the old Province of Canada, however lively were the feelings of religious difference in that old Province, when we settled a somewhat similar question. I refer, Sir, to this statement because I wish to express the hope that, in the interval between 1869 and 1882, the hon. gentleman has advanced in his views, has observed the current of events, and will now be disposed to take a different line, and instead of acting on the precedent which he himself then created by moving the previous question, in order, as he stated, that there should be an effectual barrier to similar resolutions in the future, he may be disposed to admit

OUR RIGHT TO TENDER SOME ADVICE

on this occasion, and give his support to the motion before the House. I say we have an

interest, as a part of the great Empire—as sharers in its prosperity, as sharers in its shame; we have an interest in everything which will tend to develop the strength and the unity of that Empire; we have an interest in every great and important question affecting the general constitution and organization of the Empire at large. Nobody can doubt that, through chaos and without any formal system, the gradual tendency of the constitution of the Empire has been more and more—mainly through drift, sometimes of design—towards the adoption of the federative form. We ourselves in Canada are the outcrop of that idea. Our present position is due to its partial, unsymmetrical, unreasoned, but practical development; and I say, Sir, we must conclude that, without power effectually to interfere, without power of legislation, we yet have a right,

AS MEMBERS OF THE EMPIRE,

to express an opinion upon this subject. As a part of the Empire largely peopled by old countrymen—by Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen—we have a deep interest in a question which must materially affect the prosperity and happiness of our countrymen and kinsmen in the old land. As a country wanting immigrants, as the hon. gentleman has said, we have a material interest to a very great degree. We all know where the Irish emigration goes; we all know that those who cross the sea and land upon the shores of America go almost wholly, particularly those of the Roman Catholic faith, to the United States instead of to Canada; we know that our share of the Irish emigration is insignificant, and that our share of the Irish Roman Catholic emigration is but a very small proportion in these latter days of even our share of the total Irish emigration. We know, on the other hand, that enormous numbers of that people have gone to the United States. When I said two years ago that that was due largely to the difficulties to which I referred, and expressed the hope that a better feeling might be engendered by remedial measures applied to the state of Ireland, hon. gentlemen opposite did not seem to sympathize with that remark. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman repeat it to-day, and I hope it has become, to a large extent, the accepted sentiment of the people of this country. We are interested materially in another sense in this question.

WE AND OUR NEIGHBOURS

have a common frontier 3,000 miles in length. The Republic is, and must always be, a

country in our cordial and friendly relations with which must lie a great part of our own prosperity; and no man can doubt that the existence of the Irish question is a main feature of the difficulties between the United Kingdom and the United States, and that it cannot but react most unfavourably upon us. We recollect what has happened in former days; we recollect when our peace was broken, our territory more than once invaded, when expense was incurred and blood was shed; we recollect that such a state of things existed in the United States that redress, whether by expression of regret or by pecuniary compensation, was absolutely denied, on the score, I presume, that the state of feeling in that country rendered it impossible for any such concession to be made. If you look at some of the figures of the recent census you will see how, directly and indirectly—directly, as wanting immigrants ourselves; indirectly, as men with whom the people of the United States should be on friendly terms—we are interested in this question. Take the State of Massachusetts, in which, out of a population of 1,625,000, the foreign-born people, if I remember rightly, number some 420,000 souls, and of these no less than about 240,000 were born in Ireland; so that more than one-half of the foreign-born population of the State of Massachusetts is of Irish birth, while if you add to those the number who are the descendants of Irishmen in that State, you will see what a powerful factor in the prosperity and progress of that country is the Irish immigration. Of that immigration

WE WANT A SHARE FOR OURSELVES,

and we want still more earnestly that those who choose the Republic instead of the Dominion shall not choose the Republic with feelings of animosity and dissatisfaction towards the Empire of which we form a part, but with those friendly feelings which animate the Englishmen and Scotchmen who also happen to prefer, for material reasons, the Republic to the Dominion. Now, Sir, there is another reason why we should interfere. We can speak with authority on this subject; we are Federalists ourselves; we are experienced in the benefits of Home Rule; we know what it means; we know that it is our most precious possession; we know that there is nothing that we would part with upon greater reluctance or more difficulty than

OUR PORTION OF HOME RULE;

we know that there is nothing that we would sacrifice more to retain than our portion of Home Rule, whether you refer to that portion which the Dominion has in relation to the Empire, or that portion which the Provinces have in relation to the Dominion. In reference to either the imperfect federation which exists between Canada and the United Kingdom, or the more perfect form of federation which exists between the Dominion and the Provinces, if any people in the wide world can speak of the difficulties engendered from the want of Home Rule, and the benefits to be secured by the grant of Home Rule, it is the people in whose name and for whose interests we sit and deliberate in this hall this night. Now, Sir, the descendant of Irishmen myself—my grandfather by the father's side a rector of the church to which I have referred, and sleeping in his parish churchyard, and my ancestor by my mother's side slain in conflict with insurgents—while it might have been my misfortune, had I been born and bred in the old land, to adopt from prejudice views very different from those I have expressed this night, yet, it being my good fortune to have been born and bred in the free air of Canada, and to have learned those better, those wiser, those more Christian and just notions, which here prevail upon the subjects of civil and religious liberty, class legislation, and Home Rule itself, I have always entertained, ever since I have had the opportunity of thinking on this subject, the sentiments to which I have given feeble utterance, this evening. I believe that these are the sentiments native to

OUR OWN SENSE OF FREEDOM AND JUSTICE,

of forbearance and toleration, and that we wish to deal on this subject, as the hon. gentleman said who moved it, in that spirit which says, "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you." I had been anxious that this discussion should be raised, and had myself prepared a motion on the subject when private circumstances called me from my desk here. On my return I learnt that the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Victoria had alluded had taken the matter in hand, and it was thought better not to meddle with them, or with the course that they, under his leadership, might propose. But, although I remained silent, I must say that I think that it would be doing but scant justice to the feeling of Canadians, French, Scotch, English or Irish, to suppose

that there is any material difference in their feeling on this subject from that of those whom the hon. gentleman who brought forward the motion more particularly seems to represent. I believe our sentiments are based on the general principles of political action to which we have been educated, and which have advanced our prosperity and our intellectual and moral standing in the world. Now, I heard the hon. gentleman's resolution with some regret—for one reason, that I find it emasculated. I find it very much weaker than the resolution which he put on the paper in the first instance. In some particulars it does not suit my view. He has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, but, not willing to repeat that error, I myself prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get. Yet

I WILL VOTE WITH RELUCTANCE

for the motion, which only hypothetically refers to the grant of a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman says in the altered resolution :

"And we would venture to express a hope that, if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, some means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard.

"We would further express a hope that the time has come when your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interest of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty be restored to them."

We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that their best security is to be found in a united Irish people, managing their own affairs. I say that the passage of such a measure is essential to the integrity of the Empire. There ought to be no "ifs" or "ands" in the expression of the views of the Canadian people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view, that the passage of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to speak hypothetically. I am not disposed to deal with this question with "ifs" and "ands." I am willing to advise absolutely conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government respectfully, but

firmly and plainly, that as 4,000,000 of British subjects, they believe that the integrity of the Empire demands

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND.

So with reference to the clause that speaks of those men deprived of the constitutional right of trial by jury. I do not understand them to invite the clemency of the Crown. I do not understand them to be charged with political offences. I understand them to be imprisoned under a law which does not call on the Government to charge them with any crime whatever. What we ought to have asked for those men is the restoration of the *habeas corpus*, and a trial by their peers on any charge which the Government of England may think fit to make against them. It is not an application for clemency and mercy that they make, or that we should express, but a hope that the ordinary constitutional right of every British subject may be extended to these particular British subjects—namely, the right of *habeas corpus* and of trial by their peers for any offence with which they may be charged against the law of the land to which they belong. I hope that the resolution, weak as it is, unsatisfactory as it is ; failing, as in my opinion it does, in those two points ; framed as it is in a manner which I do not myself admire, will yet pass ; because it is not amendable, and it is infinitely better that it should pass than that it should be rejected because some may think it too weak and others too strong. In this question I have shown we are interested in many ways, and that, although we have no direct voice in the legislation of Great Britain, we have, notwithstanding, a right to venture our counsel and express our views. We have a right respectfully to approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of her Prime Minister, whose sentiments are not hostile, but are favourable to reform. We are entitled to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained, to the attainment of rights too long denied, and so to enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form a part.

The following is the resolution, to which Mr. Blake spoke :

That an humble Address be presented to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, in the following words :

Most Gracious Sovereign :

We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament

assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name, and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

1. We have observed, may it please Your Majesty, with feelings of profound regret and concern, the distress and discontent which has prevailed for some time among Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

2. We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that your Irish subjects in the Dominion of Canada are among the most loyal, most prosperous, and most contented of Your Majesty's subjects.

3. We would further respectfully represent to Your Majesty that the Dominion of Canada, while offering the greatest advantages and attractions for those of our fellow-subjects who may desire to make their homes amongst us, does not receive that proportion of emigrants from Ireland which might reasonably be expected, and that this is due, in a great measure, in the case of many of our Irish fellow-subjects who have sought foreign homes, to their feelings of estrangement towards the Imperial Government.

4. We would further most respectfully represent to Your Majesty that, in the interests of this your loyal Dominion and of the entire Empire, it is extremely to be desired that Your Majesty may not be deprived, in the development of Your Majesty's possessions on this continent, of the valuable aid of those of Your Majesty's Irish subjects who may feel

disposed to leave their native land to seek more prosperous homes.

5. We desire respectfully to suggest to Your Majesty that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that, if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, some means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's Empire, and that Your Majesty's Irish subjects at home and abroad may feel the same pride in the greatness of Your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of Your Majesty's rule, and the same devotion to and affection for our common flag, as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.

6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may, for your people's sake, be long continued.

HON. EDWARD BLAKE'S SPEECH ON THE BILL FOR THE
SECOND READING OF THE INCORPORATION OF
THE ORANGE ORDER, MARCH 17TH, 1884
(CONDENSED).

MR. BLAKE said:—*Mr. Speaker*: Upon this question parties are divided. It is well known that the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite are divided; and it is known that the Liberal party does not think, or speak, or act, as a unit on this question. I am not speaking, I do not propose to speak, this evening, in any shape or sense in the capacity which I hold as leader for the time being of the Liberal party, but do speak only in my individual capacity as a member of Parliament. I am not speaking for any one but myself. Although I gave a silent vote on the last occasion when this question was before us, and although but for what has occurred since then I should have repeated that silent vote, I feel bound, on this occasion to express my views upon the Bill before the House.

I am about to state my own views frankly on this question. I dare say they will not please extreme men on either side, but I hope that to some moderate men those views may be acceptable. In the first place, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) alleges that this Bill is similar, upon the constitutional ground, to other Bills which we have dealt with. I think there is a very marked distinction, on the constitutional ground, between this Bill and the other Bills.

Now, with reference to the particular measure before the House, there can be no doubt whatever that the general question of the incorporation of the society for the purpose for which its promoters ask its incorporation—which, as they say, is merely in order that they may have a corporate entity enabling them to hold real property—is one of civil rights and property. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that this is within the control and the exclusive control of the Local Legislatures. The report of the Minister of Justice (Sir John A. Macdonald) upon the Orange Bill of 1873, passed by the Ontario Legislature, which was reserved, reads thus:

"If the Acts should again be passed, the Lieutenant-Governor should consider himself bound to

deal with them at once, and not ask your Excellency to interfere in matters of Provincial concern and solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the legislature of the Province."

That was a perfectly correct statement. It is true it applied to Provincial incorporation; but it was a perfectly correct statement that this proposed incorporation was not merely within, but solely and exclusively within, the competence of the Province. There have been Acts passed, as we know, in several of the Legislatures, granting the Orange Order incorporation. The Order has been incorporated in Manitoba, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick—in three at least of the Provinces. And we know also that it is not because these incorporations are deficient for the purpose for which they were made, that the applicants come here. They do not come because they want more power in Nova Scotia, Manitoba, or New Brunswick; not at all. The present incorporation is adequate for all the purposes they want, only they cannot get incorporation in enough Provinces—that is the question. This case is quite different from the class of cases in which I am willing that Dominion Legislation should intervene, to clear up any doubts arising from the decision to which I have alluded; it is not to implement such legislation, but it is because legislation cannot be obtained in some Provinces that the parties come here. It is not to confirm, not to complete the legislation of any Province in regard to which difficulty had arisen under our complex system; but it is to coerce Provinces into accepting legislation which the Provinces would not otherwise pass. I wish to make good the propositions I advance as I proceed, and I shall do this by quoting extracts. I find that the Grand Secretary of the Order (Mr. Keyes) said this:

"Bills have been passed by five of the Provincial Legislatures incorporating our association; but through no fault of ours, in three of these Provinces, Ontario, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island the Bills have never become law. Under these circumstances, and in order to settle the question, we have

appealed to the Parliament of Canada for the passage of a general Act of incorporation for our society in the Dominion."

There you see it is not to supplement, to make good and perfect local legislation, but because local legislation cannot be obtained, that they come here to obtain that which they cannot get in the proper quarter.

Then, I have a report from the Secretary of a county lodge, as late as February, 1884. He says:

"We must not permit any political feeling in this matter, as it is very important to our institution to have a Dominion Act of incorporation.

"Without such Act, our noble brethren in the Province of Quebec will be without one, as you all know it is no use for them to ask for incorporation in their Provincial Legislature, where Protestants are in the minority."

There you see, Mr. Speaker, once again, that it is because incorporation cannot be obtained in a particular Province or in particular Provinces, that they come here, and not because there is some difficulty or defect in the power of Provincial Legislation, which they want us here to heal. This view is not a view which is held by those who oppose the measure alone; it was held by leading Orangemen. Leading members of the order, up to a comparatively recent period, held the view that the measure should not be brought here; that it was a matter of Provincial concern and should be discussed elsewhere. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) who introduced the Bill last Session, and who has occupied a very high position in the Order, and who still holds a high position, speaking in Winnipeg after the defeat of the Bill of last Session, said:

"He, along with Brother Marshall and other members of the Order, had asked that the Incorporation Bill be not sent to the House of Commons, as he thought it should be fought out in the Ontario Legislature; and if defeated there, they should wait till their friends gained power; but in spite of all argument on his part, he had been forced to take the Bill into the House."

Again, the hon. gentleman said, in a speech at Brockville, after the Session of Parliament:

"At the Session of Parliament he found himself needing more assistance than ever before in his life.

"Many of his friends were adverse to the Bill being given a second reading: they were divided as to its effect; and in this way he found himself assailed on all sides."

* * * * *

"Prominent Conservatives advised him to withdraw the Bill."

Once again at Hamilton, he said:

"He was willing to admit that the Orangemen themselves were not as united in asking for the Bill

as they might have been. They did not act as unanimously as they should have done; and there was no use in denying the fact that a certain portion of their own organization did not want the Bill to come to a second reading."

Mr. Marshall, a gentleman holding high office at Winnipeg, said:

"He had been opposed to sending the Incorporation Bill to the Dominion House. The battle had been commenced in Ontario, and should be fought out there."

These are statements all made since the defeat of the Bill last Session, and they seem to indicate that, on the part of leading members of the Order itself, there was a strong feeling adverse to the propriety of introducing this Bill here, and favourable to the view which I have ventured to take in this House, that substantially and essentially this is an attempt to make use of the power of this Parliament under the pretence that Dominion incorporation is really wanted and is really needed, when the reality of the case is, that Provincial incorporation is all that is really wanted and is really needed. And it is because the Provinces cannot be induced to grant that incorporation, or, at all events, because such is the case in some of them, that it is proposed to use alleged Dominion power to force the measure on those localities that object to it. By the Bill itself and as much of the constitution of the Order as we are acquainted with, it is a divided organization, with Provincial, county, district and private lodges; and the local branches are to have the right to hold property.

I say that the essence of this Bill is alleged by the promoters to be the right to hold real property. I say that the right to hold real property is, if anything be such, a Provincial right—a dealing with property and civil rights. I say that we should not strain our jurisdiction to grasp that right in any case. I say, that we are to use our jurisdiction where we have it, for we may have it in some cases, as incidental to some classes of Dominion incorporations. For instance, I have supported, in this House, as a necessary incident of railway companies incorporated by us, the power of expropriating land. It is a necessary incident of our power to incorporate certain classes of railways, that we should have that power of expropriation, and we use that power because it belongs to us. But I say that we should watch jealously, and when it is proposed to go beyond the necessary incidents of corporate rights, and when the whole essence of the corporation is, as it is claimed, the right to hold real prop-

erty, it should be a very strong case which should lead us to interfere with it. And when we are told that the real reason why the promoters come here is not because the Provincial incorporation would not be adequate, but because they cannot get enough Provinces to agree to incorporate them, that should end the question of the propriety of our interference. I maintain that they should go to the Legislature of Quebec for incorporation in Quebec, and to the Legislature of Ontario for incorporation in Ontario, and as Mr. Marshall and the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) have said, fight their battle there; and if popular feeling is ultimately with them, they will get their incorporation, and if it should remain against them, they must content themselves without it.

MR. BLAKE OPPOSED TO STATE RECOGNITION
OF SECRET SOCIETIES.

But it is not only upon this ground that I personally am opposed to this Act of incorporation. I entertain views on the point to which I am about to address myself, which, I dare say, are shared only by a small minority in this House, but none the less do I entertain them. I am opposed to State recognition of secret societies. I do not care how good their purposes, or what their objects may be; I believe it is a mistake to lay down the principle that any secret society should be recognized by the State. I think secret, oath-bound societies are, so far as that point may be brought fairly into question in this case—though I agree that we are to decide it upon our own notions of what is right—I say that such societies are contrary to the spirit of English law as to recognized societies. I know they are contrary to the Quebec criminal law. Now, the Quebec criminal law is not to be modified by a private Bill in this House.

Your law should be amended first on general principles; and then if you find that the institution is one which you can legally incorporate, you may proceed to give it incorporation. Now, as I have said, I am not in favour of State recognition of any secret societies. I have never joined one, though many of my best friends are members of secret societies which are, as this professes to be, benevolent—secret societies which do not meddle at all with political topics—secret societies whose real action, so far as one of the public can know, is not inconsistent with, and does not go beyond, the avowed purposes of their association. But I believe the

tendency of secrecy itself to be injurious. I believe that it brings with it the possibility of evil; I believe that it involves a certain amount of sacrifice of individuality and independence and gives very great facilities for the misleading of members by designing leaders—very great and mischievous facilities for that purpose. That is my general proposition with reference to secret, oath-bound societies, a point on which, I dare say, as I said before, I am in a small minority; for I suppose the vast bulk of at least the Protestant members of this House belong to one or other of those societies; and I do not wish to be understood as saying that these mischievous tendencies are carried out in many of those societies, the operations of which, so far as I know, are beneficial. But these things are to be dealt with on general principles; and I maintain that secrecy is in itself a bad thing, and if societies are beneficial they are beneficial in spite of, and not because of this element of secrecy. Now there are, of course, three attitudes which the State can take towards these societies, that is, suppression, recognition and neutrality. And I maintain that, unless a society be one for an obviously bad purpose, in this age and under our circumstances, the only course to take is not to suppress, not to recognize, but to

OCCUPY A NEUTRAL POSITION

with reference to it; not to interfere one way or the other, not to give State recognition, not to attempt—what is in most cases a fruitless attempt—suppression. Those who talk of the benefits of secret societies have, I think, read the history of early and of later periods, and of very late periods especially, on the continent of Europe, in the United Kingdom and in the United States, after a fashion in which I have not read it. I believe that a great deal of the trouble, social and political, that has occurred in those countries is due to secret societies; and I think that we who hail from one or other of the quarters of the United Kingdom, we who are doubly interested in the peace, prosperity and contentment of each one of the three United Kingdoms, must have marked from early days what a baneful influence secret societies have had upon that part of the United Kingdom which, unfortunately has given so much cause for trouble, and humiliation and difficulty, to the Parliament of England, and to the English people throughout the world. When you remember the Ribbon Society, the Phoenix Society, the Fenian Society, all the other

societies of this class to which I have referred, you will see very easily what immense possibilities of evil there are in the attribute of secrecy. Now, Sir, this is a view which is shared by many who have thought on this subject. I met, the other day, in a book which Mr. A. M. Sullivan has not long since written, an observation which struck me as being so pregnant that I shall trouble the House with it. He says :

"I had not studied in vain the history of secret oath-bound associations. I regarded them with horror. I knew all that could be said as to their advantages in revolutionizing a country, but even in the firmest and best of hands they had a direct tendency to demoralization, and were often, on the whole, more perilous to society than open tyranny."

That is the statement of a very eminent man who was actively engaged in an agitation for what he believes, and what many of us believe, would be the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people. He saw what an important agency these societies would be ; but he saw also from a sad personal experience, and from his own observation, what evil and demoralizing tendencies they have. The difficulty as to State recognition is this—it is essential ; you cannot get rid of it, it is in the circumstance that the society is secret—you cannot determine how far, being secret it may depart from its professed and avowed objects ; how far, being secret, it may go, in what direction it may travel ; how far, being ostensibly a religious and benevolent, it may become a political society and not benevolent or religious ; how far, being loyal, it may go in the opposite direction, as we know professedly loyal societies have gone in days gone by—how far this may be the case, you cannot determine ; and, therefore, I say that State recognition ought not to be given to secret, oathbound societies. You cannot tell what sort of tyranny may not be exercised by them. It is in the nature of these societies to become tyrannical and despotic.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND ACTION STIFLED.

Openness and public discussion are the great guarantees of order, freedom, fairness and moderation. It is in private gatherings of men, all of one turn of thought, all of one opinion, that bitterness and misrepresentation and malignity revel and hold high carnival. It is just there that you are sure to have the very worst of that description of difficulty which exists too commonly even in all our public life, and which is tempered only in so far as our discussions are open, in the presence of the world, and of men of different opinions. It may be that in oppressed coun-

tries, despotically governed, secret societies are a melancholy necessity. It is possible. I do not admit it ; but it may be so. They may be the only recourse of those countries which are aspiring to freedom. But that is not the condition of the people of this country. There is nothing here that we want, there is no amelioration of our condition that we desire, which we are not free to propose in public gathering, upon which we are not free to engage in public discussion. If we believe that those of a particular creed amongst us entertain sentiments not merely erroneous in point of dogmatic religion (which has nothing to do with the question) but sentiments hostile to the Constitution or dangerous to social order, we have a right to say so, a right to resist them, a right to challenge their opinions, and to challenge them to express their opinions. But we have no right, because we have no necessity, to engage for these purposes in secret societies, which, as I have indicated, have often been the fruitful mothers of malignity, misrepresentation and bigotry. The Bill, however, goes much further than simply giving the right to hold property. As I have said ; it gives State recognition ; it gives a corporate existence. For this purpose it invokes the Interpretation Act ; and the last clause gives this society power to carry on its work.

THE ORANGE SOCIETY ALMOST WHOLLY POLITICAL IN ONTARIO.

Now, my hon. friend from Huron alluded to a point which met with some cries of denial at first ; but I did not observe, when he came to be answered, that his proposition was seriously challenged. He alluded to the proposition that the purposes of this society were almost wholly political. I am not going to discuss how the Orange society works in the other Provinces of the Dominion ; I do not know how it works in the other Provinces ; I do not know how far it is true to the professed objects of the institution, or how far it goes beyond them ; I do not know whether it attempts objects peculiarly political or not ; but, I think I speak of what I do know, when I say that my hon. friend's observation as to Ontario is perfectly correct ; and I think the circumstance that, after being met with those cries of denial, when an answer was attempted to be made to his argument, this statement was not denied, is sufficient proof of that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). He said that Orangemen were expelled for voting for the Reform party. I deny that.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how that may be ; but I shall furnish the hon. gentleman some information on that point before I am done. I maintain that the Order is political in Ontario, and I say that the objections to State recognition of secret societies are doubly strong—in point of fact, they receive their chief vitality, when they are applied to secret political organizations. In politics, if anywhere, it is in open discussion only that there is safety, in open attack and defence, in public charges and public answers. Why, many of us believe, and, I am sure, most of us would gladly agree—if it were practicable, I do not think it is—many of us believe that the greatest boon would be conferred upon the public if you could abolish private canvassing, if you could arrange that the only mode of canvassing would be to meet the electors of both sides openly at public meetings and there avow your principles and define your positions. Why? Because we know that a private canvass gives opportunities for statements which suit the political complexion of the person addressed ; because we know that it gives opportunities for private statements of the political faith of the candidate and for private assaults upon the political faith and standing of an opponent, and that it is in every way objectionable. I believe myself that publicity is the very breath of freedom in politics ; and I have not hesitated to declare that, though I voted for the ballot as essential to freedom, I was never able to reconcile myself to the idea that we should always be obliged to poll our votes secretly ; because I believe it would be a very great advance if the day should come, when we could believe that to all our people an open vote would be a free vote. It is only because there are cases where an open vote is not a free vote, that I yielded to the ballot as a necessity, and in order that the vote might be free. Apart from that, I believe the effect of the ballot itself to be injurious rather than advantageous. To bear out what I have said, with reference to political organizations, I shall give you an instance in my own career. The first time I entered public life, 1867, I was contesting two counties, one for the Local and one for this House. They were from 200 to 250 miles apart, and I had to run from one to the other in the course of my canvass. At a certain point, shortly before I left the South Riding of Bruce, to go down to West Durham, I found that a secret canvass was being made against me, promoted by this religious and benevolent association. One form of this canvass was a cry to the effect

that my father was the man who shot Col. Moodie, in 1837 ; the other was a personal cry that I myself was a Roman Catholic.

Mr. WHITE. (Hastings). That must have been a Grit Orangeman.

Mr. BLAKE. Having been informed beyond a particle of doubt, that these statements were being circulated in the South Riding on behalf of the Orange organization, at the last meeting there, knowing there were men in the room who were circulating these stories, I, without repeating them, called upon those who had made them, called upon anybody to come forward and state anything derogatory either to my father or myself, and I would answer then and there. But none of them would come forward. I called on them three times at a public meeting ; but although the circulators of these calumnies were present, they would not come forward. In the West Riding of Durham, the same private canvass was going on, the same course was taken, the same precise calumnies were being circulated ; and when I came to that Riding I was asked how about this and how about that ; but I declined to deny things which no man would venture publicly to state. That is the evil of a private canvass, and especially of a private canvass conducted through the medium of a secret society. Do I object to this society because it is a political organization? Not at all. I approve of political organizations. I believe in political organizations which are public, which are avowedly political organizations, and are not afraid to declare themselves as such ; but I do not believe in secret political organizations, or in political organizations secret or otherwise, which act under the guise of religion and philanthropy. I do not object to this society because the majority of its members are opposed to me in political opinion. That is no reason for objecting to it. They have as good a right to their opinions as I have to mine, and their right to hold theirs is as dear to me as is mine to hold mine. As I hold mine by the same tenure as they hold theirs, and as I would not part, for any consideration, with the free right to hold mine, I hold their right equally dear. But if that political organization is opposed to me, I want to meet its members as such, and not as members of a religious and charitable society. Our religious opinions should be held entirely separate from our political leanings. No greater calamity can befall a community than when the cleavage of political parties is coincident with the cleavage of religious bodies. That is a great calamity and misfortune. I am anxious that, what-

ever our creeds or religious opinions may be, we should feel that they have nothing whatever to do with our political opinions, and that we should agree or differ on political questions entirely irrespective of the faith we may happen to hold on religious questions.

RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES IN POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS DEPRECATED.

The more you set up, as a combination, a great Protestant society, which is also a great political association, the more you make coincident, or strive to make coincident, the lines of division for the religious and the political convictions of the people, and act directly in the teeth of what I believe to be for the benefit of the State. Our political differences are bitter enough without introducing into them religious differences, and if the *odium theologicum*, which is known to be so bitter, is to be accentuated by political differences, it will become intolerable. Let us endeavour then not to make coincident the lines of division for political and religious opinions. Yet this society, which under the guise of religion and benevolence, is in Ontario largely and chiefly political in its power and efficacy, is doing this very thing, which I believe to be for the public evil and not for the public good. I do not propose to refer, in support of my views, as to the political complexion of this society in Ontario, to anything very ancient. I do not propose to refer even to such things so ancient as those to which the hon. member for the West Riding of Huron (Mr. Cameron) referred. It is enough for me to refer to quite recent transactions. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), made a speech in the town of Woodstock on the 12th of July last; and in that speech he made some very amusing allusions to the secret history of the conduct of this Bill. In the course of these statements, he took a line which I want to point out, and proved what I have declared with reference to this society being really and substantially a political organization. He said:

"The Bill and its requirements were put before the people of the Dominion, but, before the second reading came on, unfortunately mistakes were made. He was not going to find a great deal of fault with the Roman Catholics, or with the Reformers; but, so far as our own people were concerned, as Conservatives and Orangemen, they were not as anxious as they should have been. He would say to them, so far as the Reformers of Canada were concerned, they should not forget the fact that nine-tenths of the members of the Orange society in the Province of Ontario belonged to the Conservative party."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Suppose they do.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, suppose they do. I am sorry for it, but I do suppose it. I am merely showing that this is a political organization.

Mr. FARROW. That does not prove it.

Mr. BLAKE. If that does not prove it to the hon. member for Huron, I despair of proving it to him. I do not address the remainder of these remarks to the hon. gentleman.

"He thought, in justice, according to Reform principles, they should have passed over any little wrongs which they might have suffered in the past, and have voted for the Orange Incorporation Bill. He wished it had been so, and, if they had done it, he was satisfied that at the next election the Orangemen would have divided, and have gone in more for men and measures, and not so strongly for party."

"And not so strongly for party." That is the hon. gentleman's description of the character of the Orange organization in Ontario, that they had in the past gone very strong for party, and that in the future they might have mended their ways and gone more for men and measures. And that is not a party organization!

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Those are good words.

Mr. BLAKE. They are very good words. I wish they would be made good:

"Mr. Bunting went to Ottawa; he worked day and night for the Bill; he told the Frenchmen that if they did not pass the measure they would be doing an act of great injustice. He spoke to Sir Hector Langevin, to Sir John A. Macdonald, and other members of the Cabinet, on the subject. He referred them to the general support which the Conservative party had always received at the hands of the Orangemen."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh! it is not a political association; but it gives a general support to the Conservative party.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Those are very good words; I am not ashamed of them.

Mr. BLAKE:

"He (Mr. White) thanked Mr. Bunting for the noble assistance he gave them during that time of trial, assistance which they hoped would yet result in triumph. In conversation, along with twenty other gentlemen, with Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Bunting said: 'Sir Hector, we must have incorporation.' What was the reply? Sir Hector said: 'So far as incorporation is concerned, I personally wish you to have it, but I am opposed to all secret societies because my Church is opposed to them. I like to see the Conservative party prosperous, but I like the prosperity of my Church better than that of the Conservative party. My bishops and priests tell us, the members of the Church, not to vote for and support any such societies.' Mr. Bunting, in reply, said: 'That is a great mistake, for there are no men on earth more anxious to do justice to all parties,

and to give your Church any incorporation it may require for its benefit, than the Orangemen.' In his (Mr. White's) opinion, Sir Hector Langevin would find out that he had committed a great mistake; for, if ever he obtained the leadership of any Government in this country, it would be impossible for him to hold it without the assistance and co-operation of the Orange society."

"Theirs," said the hon. gentleman, warming into enthusiasm towards the peroration,

"Theirs was a great organization; let it be good, prudent and cautious; and he said as a Conservative, remember the next general election, if we do not succeed in getting justice before that time, judge each man by his deeds. They should take a leaf out of Archbishop Lynch's book. The Orange society were in a position to rule the whole country if they were only true to themselves."

Then, sir, the hon. gentleman also delivered an oration at Hamilton. Three cheers were given for "Sir John" at a particular period of the meeting, and the hon. gentleman followed up the cheers by saying:

"He (Sir John) was as true and as consistent a friend to the Orange Bill as any member in the House. There was a proposition made that the Bill should be withdrawn, or at least a Bill granted to all the different Provinces with the exception of the Province of Quebec. Sir John said to him: 'Mr. White don't accept that, for if you do it will only bring disgrace on your society. Better have the Bill carried for the whole Dominion, but don't disgrace yourselves by deserting the worthy members of your Order in the Province of Quebec.' Those were good words, and he was satisfied that nothing in the world would have given Sir John Macdonald greater pleasure than handing the Incorporation Bill to the Governor for his sanction, because Sir John was satisfied in his own mind that nine-tenths of the Orange members belonged to the Conservative party."

Why, I see the hon. member is amused. I thought I would amuse him.

MR. WHITE (Hastings). That speech of mine, which he is reading, is the best part of the hon. gentleman's speech.

MR. BLAKE. My proofs are always the best part of my speeches, and this is my proof:

"Supposing Sir Hector Langevin were the leader of a great party, and in his ranks there was a society which was as true to him as the Orange society had been to Sir John Macdonald, he would go to Sir John and say: 'It is necessary, in the interests of our party, that this society, which is loyal to the Queen, to the constitution, and to the country, should have an Act of Incorporation.' Sir John would have answered: 'Yes, with all my heart, you shall have it.' The Prime Minister was leading a party that was fair and just, while Sir Hector Langevin was leading a party that was bound hand and foot to the Church of Rome, which possessed a grasping disposition, taking everything and giving nothing."

Well, then, the hon. gentleman had occasion to speak of the Minister of Customs, and,

after giving him a very great laudation for the mode in which he executed his office, he said:

"Orangemen had looked forward and expected him to speak on the second reading of the Bill, and in not doing so he (Mr. White) thought he had made a great mistake. They were proud of him when he stood up in the Commons Chamber and got Riel expelled from it; when he took the step of bringing the first Commoner, Mr. Speaker Anghin, to the Bar of the House to answer for his violation of the law which he helped to pass—the Independence of Parliament Act. He (Mr. White) did not know why the Minister of Customs did not address the House on the second reading of the Bill, but he was confident that Mr. Bowell would yet retrieve the lost ground, and stand before them as he had in the past, a worthy and an honoured member of the society. If he had made a mistake, they must bear patiently with him, and he was confident that, if the time came again, and the privilege was allowed to Mr. Bowell, he would stand up and speak for the Orange Incorporation Bill, even if he lost his seat in the Cabinet."

Well, Sir, so far for the hon. gentleman, the member for Hastings. But there are some other recent proofs of the political character of this religious and benevolent organization, so far as it is managed in Ontario. Brother Marshall, to whom I already alluded, who occupied a high position in the Order, and who was with the hon. gentleman at Winnipeg, says:

"The question was asked how they always voted Tory; and the answer was because that party had befriended them."

You see the statement is "they always voted Tory;" but they are not a political organization! At the Grand Lodge meeting at St. Catharines, the Grand Master, Mr. Merrick, who is also a member of the Local Legislature, said:

"I hope it will teach us a lesson for our future conduct not to trust to a mere political party as such, but to support and work with our best energies for those who will support and work for us; and then, no doubt, we will be able to say, with the Grand Master of New South Wales:

"In connection with the recent Parliamentary elections we find that in every locality throughout the electorates when a lodge was in operation the chosen candidate of the lodge received the greater number of votes."

But it is not a political organization! Then Mr. Johnson, at the same meeting, said:

"The Brethren should endeavour to make the association less of a political organization, and more of a religious and benevolent association."

MR. WHITE (Hastings). How would that suit you?

MR. BLAKE. That would suit me very well; but I do not perceive that the hon. gentleman is "a doing of it," Sir. Then

there was a grand meeting of the Triennial Council in England, at which Canadian delegates were present, including Mr. Marshall and Mr. Bennett. Speeches were made by Mr. Bennett and others; and some of them indicated the condition of the Order in another colony, and so far are not uninteresting. Mr. Neale, who represented New Zealand, South Australia and Queensland, spoke and said:

"The last general election was the grandest triumph for Orangeism ever witnessed in New South Wales. We gained no less than twenty-eight seats in the Colonial Parliament; and a very large number of the other members were returned through the Orange vote, and only eight Romanists succeeded in gaining admission."

That was the statement which these Canadian delegates heard, and which shows the condition of things, and the way the Order is worked in New South Wales. At that meeting Mr. Bennett was present representing Ontario, and he made this statement:

"I may also tell you that we have in our country an Orange paper, and we have found it to have a beneficial and magical effect, because divided as the Protestants are in the country into two political parties, each of these parties bidding for the Romanist vote, so that the organs of these political parties dare not, for fear of offending the Roman Catholics, say anything in favour of Orangeism—having a paper of our own, we not only got all the Orange news from all parts of the world, but have an organ not only to put forth our views to the country, but to repel all attacks that may be made on us by the Roman Catholic and Jesuit press of the country."

So that you find, Sir, that the Order is a political organization, and that in Ontario at the present day, by the confession of its leading men, though it comes here claiming incorporation as a religious and benevolent association, the guise in which it appeals to its friends, and the voice with which it speaks to those whom it asks to support it, are political.

A TORY TRAINING SCHOOL

They say they are a political organization. They vote almost unitedly one way; they are a party political organization. Nor, Sir, is it to be wondered at, for we all know that in both the great branches from which the order springs, the Irish Grand Lodge and the English Grand Lodge, the Order was for a great many years, and I believe is still, political. I do not intend myself to attempt any account of the origin, and still less of the progress and work of the Irish lodges, but I intend to read a brief extract from a letter written by Sir Francis Hincks a few years ago, in which he says:

"I have read in many newspapers, as well as in the sermon of Rev. Mr. Doudiet, a similar expression

of opinion; that the causes of offence to Irish Roman Catholics is the celebration of the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne. I believe that those who entertain this opinion are labouring under a complete delusion from which it is most desirable that they should be freed. Irish Roman Catholics would never have resented the celebration of an ordinary victory, but the Battle of the Boyne was the first of a series of victories which led to the complete subjugation of Catholic Ireland to Protestant Great Britain, and the effect of that subjugation was that a Protestant minority, settled chiefly in one of the four Provinces of Ireland, was enabled to rule a Roman Catholic majority in the three other Provinces, with a rod of iron, during the eighteenth century.

"The motto of the Protestant minority for years before the Orange lodges came into existence, was 'Protestant Ascendancy,' and this was maintained by penal laws, every amelioration of which laws was resisted by Orangemen with all the rigour for which they have ever been distinguished. When it is borne in mind that for nearly a century after the Battle of the Boyne, no Roman Catholic could either be elected or vote for a member of Parliament, that no Roman Catholic could be a lawyer or solicitor, that no Roman Catholic could keep arms, that his children could not be educated, and that his clergy were proscribed, that no Roman Catholic could own a horse worth over £5; when it is further borne in mind that every amelioration of those penal laws was gradually extorted from the Protestant minority, which was alone represented in the English Parliament by the influence of English statesmen who, differing upon other questions, were nearly all favorable to the gradual repeal of the penal statutes; when, I say, all this is considered, it is not difficult to understand the hatred that is felt by Irish Catholics to an institution whose distinguishing principle is 'Protestant ascendancy,' and whose members habitually proclaim their adherence to this principle by their flags and party tunes—'Protestant Boys,' and 'Croppies lie down.'"

Sir Francis Hincks goes on to point out the continued political operations of the Irish Orangemen with reference to Catholic emancipation, and with reference to Church disestablishment, as showing their active operation as a political body, up to a comparatively recent period. He proceeds to point out that the Orange organization has existed in the Province of Upper Canada, that there they were opposed to certain reforms, the promoters of which they were pleased to call disloyal; and he shows that they there also were a political organization. So, sir, with reference to the English lodges; you will find that at a very early day in the enquiry that was made as to the Orange Institution in Great Britain and Ireland, not very long after the Order had been instituted in England, the Deputy Grand Secretary was asked some questions, and, speaking of its true character, he answered as follows:

"I should not hesitate to say it had reference to Conservative Associations more than Orange, but I consider the one as interwoven with the other."

"By 'it,' do you mean the Loyal Orange Institution? I should rather say, taken by surprise as I am, that it must mean the Conservative Institution; I have always considered the two to be so interwoven, with a difference of name, that it is of little consequence."

"Are you to be understood to say, that you believe the Carlton Club and the Orange Institution are generally interwoven in their views, but you consider the Carlton (1) more political and the Orange Institution more religious?—Yes."

Then I think, Sir, that pretty effectually proves that in the opinion of the Deputy Grand Secretary, THE ORANGE INSTITUTION AND THE CARLTON CLUB were institutions of different names indeed, but having pretty much the same object. That is also proved, practically, by the papers which were produced at that time. Amongst others was the report of the Grand Secretary, in 1835, in which he says :

"Perhaps the way of all others, in which Orangeism can be turned to the best account, or can be rendered available to beneficial objects, is by a practical observance of its fundamental principles, when the executive feels a necessity for making an appeal to the sense of the nation. Hence it may not be superfluous to add, from representation to the D.G.S., both orally and in writing, that, in disregard of the 'obligation' which is so much their proud but empty boast, a number of Orangemen have bestowed their suffrages on persons well known to be opposed to the establishments of the land, and unfavorable to the existence of their own body. So at variance in such conduct, not merely with the spirit but with the letters of the laws by which their movements ought to be guided—so contrary was it to the votes, no less from feeling than from honour, which they are bound to have given—as to call for and demand their dismissal from a society, whose interest they had betrayed and whose safety they had endangered. As men, their indisputable right to exercise the freedom of election would never be questioned; but as members of an institution who associate for the purpose of loyalty and for the repudiation of such a liberalism of sentiment, they ought to be restrained in so anomalous a course, which is calculated to cast a suspicion on the integrity of, to the entailment of a degradation with a mixture of contempt on, all belonging to it."

"In illustration of the above, the D.G.S. has to offer an extract of a letter that he received from the D.G.M. of Rochdale soon after the election, than which nothing can more strongly show the justness of the remarks he had previously put forth, in condemnation of so vile a departure from the pure essence of sound Orangeism, as therein is reported to him thus officially by that functionary, viz. :

"'No doubt you have heard of the triumph,' says the writer, 'we have gained over the Whig candidate, by the election of John Entwistle, Esq., of Foxholes, as the representative of this borough. Yet after obtaining the victory, I am not altogether satisfied, as three of our members voted for the Whig party, contrary to the principles of our loyal institution. The names of the persons who have gone against us are Richard Simpson, of warrant 68; James Whittles, 266; and John Crossley, 302. The brethren of my district call aloud for the expulsion of these offenders. For Crossley I feel

strongly, as he was compelled, by his master, to vote contrary to his wishes. I hope, therefore, you will take his case into your kind consideration, as I believe him to be really a true Orangeman. I shall feel obliged by your advice in what manner I am to act under these circumstances. At the ensuing meeting of the Grand Lodge, I hope you will lay this case before its dignitaries. In the mean time I shall await your answer with impatience.'

"Much credit is due to the D. G. M. of Rochdale for his prompt report of these delinquents, as well as to the brethren of the district for their just reprehension of characters so unworthy of their fellowship. Other accounts of a similar though of a less specific colour, have been transmitted to the D. G. S., whose best attention to them shall be especially given on his approaching tour of general inspection. With the names of the districts most disaffected he is well acquainted, and those Masters who shall appear to have connived at, nay, not to have used strong efforts to prevent these offences, may expect soon to be superceded in their command. Such a desertion from principle on the part of the brotherhood, and such a dereliction of duty on the part of their officers, at a conjuncture of peril too like the present, when the altar and the sceptre are alike in danger, can no longer be suffered to pass with impunity. As an example, then, to deter, rather than to punish, let the two chief transgressors stand expelled, and the one so unduly influenced be suspended."

"Hence while their cordial support was due to candidates cherishing sentiments congenial with conservative doctrines, they were bound to withhold it from aspirants entertaining ideas unfavourable to legitimate designs. Indeed it was absolutely imperative on them as Orangemen to uphold persons who were resolved on repairing, instead of destroying our venerable monuments of antiquity by unrighteous attempts to level them with the dust."

Such was the course of conduct pursued in 1835 by the Loyal Orange Association of Great Britain.

ROMAN CATHOLICS AT FIRST BLAMED FOR DEFEATING THE BILL.

With respect to this measure now before the House : after its defeat last Session, at first there was a disposition on the part of the promoters to blame the Roman Catholic Conservative members who opposed the Bill and to deal rather lightly with Protestant Reformers. I might refer to a speech which the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) delivered in Ottawa, which the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) read in this House, and which is reported in the *Hansard* of 1883. I refer also to a speech delivered by the hon. member for East Hastings at Winnipeg, when he said :

"At the first reading, the Roman Catholic section of the House had expressed considerable sympathy, but had been compelled to oppose it, owing no doubt to instructions received from the bishops and priests. No country could afford to submit to the dictates of bishops, priests or ministers of any denomination. The Reformers said very little in the matter. The three Reform representatives from

Manitoba acted nobly, but the rest were undecided as to the action they would take. He was advised to consult Mr. Blake, but refused, as that gentleman was an Ultramontane Protestant.

"Many of the friends of the Order did not act as they should have done. They forgot that they owed their seats to Orangemen and were afraid they would be killed if they supported it, and he told them that they would die anyway.

"The Conservative party had not been as true to the cause as they might, but his advice would be to test them again; and if the Bill was defeated three times he would advocate the ballot-box."

There you see, Mr. Speaker, the disposition to which I refer, to blame those Roman Catholic members who voted against the Bill, and to deal rather lightly, as the hon. gentleman did at Ottawa, with Protestant Reformers. Then Major White said at Winnipeg:

"The Association has not the influence it ought to have because the members were not true to each other. The brethren should see to it that in all municipal and legislative bodies they had men who would truly represent them. In the past they had taken the broad view that a man's religion should not be a bar to his political preferment; but the conduct of the Roman Catholic members of the House demonstrated that they could not represent Protestants, much less Orangemen."

There again, you see the same disposition—a disposition to blame the Roman Catholic Conservative members for not voting for the Bill, to declare that it was a measure that they should have supported, and to threaten them with general ostracism in parliamentary and municipal matters.

MR. WHITE. We will grant them absolute before next election.

MR. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has the frankness and manliness to avow it. The official organ of the Orange body says:

"The bigotry displayed on Monday by every French and Irish Roman Catholic member of the House of Commons has, however, opened our eyes, and in future we shall know how to act. As we said, although the Reformers acted foolishly and illiberally, still we think, under the present state of Canadian politics, an excuse may be found for their action, but none whatever can be offered for the course pursued by the Conservative Roman Catholics, and upon their shoulders, in the greatest measure, must rest the onus of our defeat."

There again, you see the first line taken by the promoters of the Bill—they were prepared to charge the Roman Catholics, whether Conservatives, or Reformers, and particularly Conservatives, with the onus of the defeat of the Bill. The *Sentinel* says:

"For years past the Orangemen of the Dominion have under various political pretexts, and to meet the exigencies of political parties, been induced

to support Roman Catholics at the polls; but the measure of bigoted intolerance with which our liberality was met in the vote upon our Bill precludes any possibility of this mistake again occurring."

The *Sentinel* goes on to say, with respect to the leader of the Conservative party:

"The leader of the Conservative party has been charged with insincerity in his efforts to have the Bill passed, and while we believe that personally he has acted with the greatest sincerity towards us, and has used all his influence to obtain for us the redress we sought, still we cannot close our eyes to the fact that it is the first measure introduced since 1878, with his approval and sympathy, which has received such a weak support."

THREATENING REFORMERS AND CATHOLICS.

Now, Sir, that was the first start. That was the way the promoters of this Bill began to conduct the political campaign towards procuring a second reading this Session of the Orange Bill. After the defeat, they were honest enough to say that they had not much to expect from the Reformers. They did say that they had a right to expect from the Conservative Roman Catholics their support of the Bill, and they showed the true principles of their leading men, in the observations I have just now read, as to ostracism they proposed to pronounce on Roman Catholics generally, in consequence of the course of the Roman Catholic Conservatives with reference to the Bill. I have said that in Ontario the Orange Society is mainly a political organization; and I say that it subordinates all other considerations—its leaders cause it to subordinate all other considerations—to the political and party consideration. That is proved by the course which was pursued shortly afterwards. Their tactics were changed, and they seemed to think it would not do to continue blaming the Roman Catholic Tories for opposing the Bill; that this might disturb the political alliances; and, that they must throw the odium on the Protestant Liberals, and on me particularly, as what they call an Ultramontane Protestant. It would not do to go on saying that the Roman Catholic Conservatives had done wrong, and that they must not return Roman Catholics to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman did not wait until the next election to grant absolute. He granted absolute at once, and he turned the condemnation upon us, from whom, for a little space of time, he was just enough to say he had no right to expect much. And why was this done?

MR. WHITE (Hastings.) Read what I have said.

MR. BLAKE. I have read what the hon.

gentleman said—is he not satisfied? I cannot read all his speeches, but I shall gratify him. There was a meeting to which I have already referred held in Ottawa immediately after the defeat of the Bill, at which an address was presented to him, and the address contained the following paragraph:—

“From the proceedings in Parliament on the Orange Incorporation Bill, we have learned a bitter, but salutary lesson, and one that will bear fruit in due season. While we disclaim an intolerant spirit, we declare that henceforth the Roman Catholics must be prepared to reap as they have sown, and that if we are such disturbers of the peace as they declare us to be, we will for the future abstain from voting for them, and so deprive them of the power to mortify us by refusing to grant to us the same rights that we have always cheerfully accorded to them.”

The hon. gentleman's answer was as follows:

“Many Conservative members had asked and begged of him not to ruin them, but he told them that he would stand by the Order first. Another mistake was that of assisting to elect a Frenchman in Russell and an Irish Roman Catholic (Mr. Baskerville) in Ottawa city, and he said he was now ashamed of his actions; he hoped the Orangemen would forgive him for asking them to vote for Baskerville. There are very few Hawkineses. One Roman Catholic member of the House whose name he did not like to mention, said to him privately: ‘How can we vote for this Bill when the priest says he has power from the Pope to damn those of his constituencies who dare vote for a candidate for parliamentary honours who would support such a measure.’ If the Conservatives would not stand true to us, then let us be Reformers. He likened them, at the present day, as being between the devil and the deep sea—the Roman Catholics and the Reformers.”

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). One word; I believe the hon. gentleman is reading from the *Ottawa Free Press*.

Mr. BLAKE. I am reading from *Hansard*. I do not know where the report was taken from, but it was read in the House and hon. gentleman did not repudiate it.

“He kindly praised the Reformers who supported the Bill. He believed Mr. Blake had made a mistake in voting against the second reading. It was, at that time, within his grasp to have the united Orange vote of Ontario.”

THE LIBERALS BLAMED IN THE END.

Now, Sir, as I have said, the Tory politicians who lead and direct, and control the bulk of the Orangemen of Ontario, believed it would not do to continue the battle with their own allies, and, as politics are the main ingredient in their view of the Order, as it is for the propagation of their own party politics that they work the Order, they decided on taking another course; and the fight which existed

against the Roman Catholic Conservatives was put to one side, and the guns were turned against us. Sir, it reminds me of the story of the Irish duel. The First Minister with the hon. Minister of Customs on one side, and the hon. Minister of Public Works with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue on the other, met in a coffee-room with hostile intent. They met to fight the battle to the bitter end; and the poor innocent fellow who was taking his breakfast up stairs, away by himself, was astonished by a bullet coming through the floor and striking him in the leg. He asks the waiter what is going on, and he replies; “Sure it is only Mr. Moriarty and Captain O’Toole fighting a duel, but thanks be to God they both fired in the air.” The gentleman up stairs with the bullet in his leg did not thank Providence at all. This duel between the First Minister and the Minister of Customs on the one hand, and the Minister of Public Works and Minister of Inland Revenue on the other; this great demonstration of hostility, of voting squarely against one another; all this fire and fury and blood and thunder; all this threatening of slaughter ended by both combatants firing in the air, and hitting the poor fellow up stairs who had nothing to do with the row. Now, Sir, I do not propose to be hit without protest. As I have said, they have changed their ground. They have determined that they will not fight with one another but will attack us; and what is the present argument? The present argument is, that the contest over this Bill is a contest between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, and that all true Protestants must unite in supporting the Bill against the Roman Catholics. That is the argument; that is the proposition. You cannot get out of it. And if we do not agree to that proposition, we are to be told—in our religious associations among those with whom we confer, and co-operate in religious work—that we are not true Protestants, because we have not gone against the Roman Catholics by voting for carrying this measure. I have made that statement; and with reference to that statement as with reference to the others, I shall produce the proof. But, before doing so, let me give you two short extracts from recent utterances evidencing the same spirit. In November, 1882, a lodge meeting was held at Clover Hall, and an address was delivered by a great man in the order, the late local member for South Simcoe (Mr. Parkhill). He spoke as follows:

“If he observed the signs of the times correctly, there is as much need of Orangeism, both in Ireland

and Canada, at the present moment, as there ever was. True, we may not have to fight, as our forefathers fought, but we must all, whether Grits or Tories, bury our political feeling and go united to the polls in defence of Our Protestant principles."

APPEAL FOR UNITY.

What is the proposition? I am to be told, being a Reformer, that I must bury my political feelings and join with my friend, Mr. Parkhill, whom I have the pleasure of knowing, and whom I should not suspect, from his appearance, of holding such bloodthirsty principles—that we are to unite against the Roman Catholics. At Rosemont, the hon. member for South Simcoe spoke at a lodge meeting. We are told that:

"Col. Tyrwhitt, M.P., was warmly received, and made a good, practical, Protestant speech, in the course of which he referred to the utter want of political principle in the Roman Catholic electorate. The only principle that they held was allegiance to their Church, and to its interests. On such matters Roman Catholic representatives were a unit in the House of Commons. They even had an Irish Catholic party in the House of Commons last Session, who met daily to consider their interests. While all this was going on, he was sorry to admit that Orange and Protestant representatives were divided. He counselled organization and unity on the part of all Protestants, irrespective of politics, in order to stem the aggressive march of the Papacy in this our beloved Dominion."

Now this is not old. I am not reviving the buried fires of old days. This is reported on the 4th of January, 1883, and the speech was delivered on the 29th of December 1882. Then, in the *Sentinel* of 12th July, 1883, these remarks are made:

"Mr. Blake is the most prominent man in the House who voted against the Bill. He is, at least by profession, the Protestant of Protestants, from whom such a vote was not expected. * * * * He is, above all, by virtue of his leadership of the Opposition, the member of the Federal Parliament whose vote against incorporation influenced the largest number of his colleagues to vote as they did in violation of the just rights of large numbers of their constituents."

"But Mr. Blake, by his vote, threw his great influence in the House against the Bill, and, undoubtedly, thereby secured its defeat. He stultified his advocacy of Ontario's rights, and he made plain the hollow insincerity of his Protestant principles. His position in the House, his professions of Protestantism, his advocacy of Ontario's rights, made him a prominent target for the censure of Orangemen, because of a vote, which, if he were true to his principles and professions he would certainly have never given."

ANTI-ORANGE PROTESTANTS CONDEMNED.

Once again you see the assertion that this is a question between Protestant and Catholic, and that a man that professes Protestant

principles is insincere, if he votes against this Bill. There was also a lodge resolution reported in the *Sentinel*:

"We are not surprised at Roman Catholic members who put religion before party; but we strongly condemn those Protestant members who preferred party before religion."

There again this is made a religious question. We are told that we voted for our political party and against our religious principles. Then Churchill lodge passed a resolution which was particularly directed against the humble individual who now addresses you:

"We particularly condemn the action of the hon. Edward Blake, who, by voting for the Bill at one reading and against it at the next, showed that he was more anxious to embarrass his political opponents than to do justice to a large body of his fellow-Protestants; and that we consider such a trifling with the question an insult to our Order, and that in being guilty of it, the said hon. Edward Blake has proved himself unworthy of the name he bears as an ultra-Protestant, and also of the high position he occupies as leader of one of the so-called great political parties of his country."

Once again, you observe that my innocent conduct, for which I did not think I was to be blamed, in giving to this Bill what I have given to every Bill brought into this House since I have been in Parliament, and what I propose to give to almost every conceivable Bill, the courtesy of a first reading, and the opportunity for fair discussion on the second reading, is called trifling. Hon. gentlemen opposite, members of the Order, called upon us not to be so unjust as to vote against the first reading. They pointed out that the first reading was not on the merits of the Bill, but that it gave an opportunity for discussion. I thought they were right, and I accepted their views; but Churchill lodge blames me, and various members of the Order say that I was wrong. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is reported to have said:

"No doubt there is danger in the air, and the Orangemen of Ontario should become the Ultramontane Protestant party in Ontario, in contradistinction to the Roman Catholic Ultramontanes of Quebec."

Then the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), himself, at Woodstock, said:

"The day was not far distant, if we did not show more pluck and courage in opposing the growing influence of the Papacy in this Province, when we should be obliged to fight, not as Conservatives or Reformers, but as Protestants, to free ourselves from the trammels which Rome's agents sought to place on us and our institutions."

Mr. Marshall, at Winnipeg, said:

"The Bill of incorporation was not defeated by Roman Catholics, but by Protestants, who were

pandering to the Roman Catholic vote. He hoped Brother White would never ask a Catholic member to support the Bill, as he could expect no support from them; and if he did, he gave them credit for more honesty than politicians generally possessed."

And I perceive that, only the other day, on the eleventh of March, a special meeting of the Middlesex County lodge was held, at which it was resolved:

"That the county lodge of the County of Middlesex of the Loyal Orange Association is of opinion that while those who last year voted for our incorporation did but their duty in having shown their willingness to accord us those rights which we as Orangemen are ever ready to extend to all sections of Her Majesty's loyal subjects, we have no words to sufficiently express our strong condemnation of the course of those Protestant representatives, especially from Protestant Ontario, who from political spleen voted to deny us (their Protestant fellow-citizens) those rights which they are always willing sycophantly to grant to Roman Catholics; Resolved, further, that we, the representatives of the Orangemen of the County of Middlesex, will not be satisfied until our full rights in the matter of incorporation are properly accorded to us, our motto being 'No surrender and no compromise,' and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the public press."

A RELIGIOUS WAR DECLARED.

Now, Sir, I think I have shown to you that, as I have said, the line of attack was altered—that the line of attack upon their party friends, and their religious opponents, who, they at first said, ought to support the measure, and who should be ostracised for not supporting it, they were obliged to abandon, in order to strike at their opponents by representing this as a case in which all Protestants ought to combine, and in which no man of true Protestant principles could have given, or could repeat a vote against the second reading of this Bill. Well, that may be true; but if it be true, I ask this House, without distinction of creed or party, if it be not a serious state of things. I ask if it be not a serious state of things that a religious war is to be raised in this country; because that is what it is. If it be the case that, as a matter of fact, this is an issue raised between us, in which all Protestants are to be on one side, and all Roman Catholics on the other, and in which I, a firm Protestant, am to be told that I am untrue to my profession of religion, to my Protestant principles, if I do not vote with the Orangemen and against the Catholics for that Bill, is not that a serious state of things? If this be true, I say that every true lover of this country must deplore such a circumstance and must forbode the greatest evil to his country from its existence.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You are drawing

it pretty strong; you are drawing on your imagination.

Mr. BLAKE. I have given the text, and I will guarantee that the comments are justified by the text. Now, Sir, I deny entirely that there is any such necessity. I deny that there ought to exist such an issue; and I tell the hon. gentleman opposite that no matter what his threats may be, no matter whether he may say that my speech does me harm or good, he will neither seduce, nor threaten, nor drive me on any such issue into any such line or any such professions. In furtherance of this same plan, this attempt to produce a religious prejudice against those who oppose this Bill, the hon. gentleman and others are declaring that I am controlled by the Archbishop of Toronto.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). So you are.

Mr. BLAKE. I tell the hon. gentleman that he states that which is not the fact. Notwithstanding that I am relieved from the necessity of proving my case as to his statement, by his own declaration in this House, I proceed to give the evidence of that as I have given the evidence of other things. He said:

"Mr. Mowat was controlled by Archbishop Lynch and they must come to the conclusion that he, too, controlled Mr. Blake. No doubt orders went from the Palace at Toronto, and the great Reform statesmen had to obey."

I determined, as soon as I saw this statement of the hon. gentleman, that I would meet him here, face to face, and have this out with him, and have it out with him I will. This is not all. The Rev. Brother Wright, at a meeting in Leeds, said:

"They (the Orangemen) were not defeated in Parliament solely by the Roman Catholics, but through the instrumentality of Ontario politicians, who considered the smiles of Rome of greater value than the approbation of their fellow Protestants. The Bill was defeated because Archbishop Lynch said no, Christopher Fraser repeated no, and Edward Blake bowed his head and whispered no."

He voted "no," the last time; but I trust that the hon. gentleman will admit that his negative this night is not given in a whisper.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I drove you to it.

Mr. BLAKE. You drove me to it! Manage your own drove. At Winnipeg, again, the hon. gentleman said:

"Unfortunately Archbishop Lynch had Mr. Mowat bound hand and foot, and it was even hinted he was getting a hard hold on Mr. Blake, and let us hope our own leader will keep his skirts clear."

An hon. GENTLEMAN. He has "no confidence in the breed."

MR. BLAKE. My hon. friend says he has "no confidence in the breed." Now, I have had the honour of the acquaintance, for a considerable time, of His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, and I hope, being both of us Irishmen, I may even call myself his friend; but I have never, either directly or indirectly, through others or myself, by speech or writing, or in any way, had the slightest communication with Archbishop Lynch on any one political topic, of any description whatever—not this one only, but any political topic of any description. For aught I know, unless he has given public utterance to the contrary, that prelate may entertain the same view with reference to the Orange Bill as I observe the hon. member for Hastings has said Archbishop Taché does, namely, that he is in favour of its being passed. But I say that in this, as in all other particulars, I have acted entirely upon my own judgment, and wholly free from every—I will not say dictation or control—but attempt at dictation or control, hint or suggestion, knowledge or information, as to what the opinions of that prelate or of any other prelate or dignitary or persons of the Roman Catholic faith might be on the subject. I have acted on convictions which I have entertained ever since I came into public life, on convictions which I was known to have entertained in the Local Legislature, and to have expressed, not on the floor of the Legislature, but to leading members, when the question was likely to come up in the Local House, with reference to another secret organization—convictions hostile to the incorporation of secret associations, hostile to the incorporation of the Orange society. It is perfectly true that I am, as the hon. gentleman says, a Protestant, and it is also true—I suppose that is the meaning of his phrase ultramontane—that I am of that school of thought which is most opposed to what I believe to be the dogmatic errors of the Church of Rome. That is perfectly true. I protest against what I deem her errors; but I am also an earnest advocate of religious freedom and equality and the full rights of conscience.

THE LATE POLITICO-RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTIES IN QUEBEC.

As the Ontario leaders of the Orange society declare that that Province is ruled politically, by the Roman Catholic clergy, and that it must be freed from the domination of the Roman Catholic clergy by subverting Mr. Mowat, I notice they have sometimes said a word with reference to the conduct of the

Province of Quebec, and as to its rule; and I desire here to advert to this question, speaking with the same plainness of speech which I have used this evening, though I may perhaps offend some of those who may have listened with approval to some things I have hitherto said. I say I do not find this pretention to be the exclusive standard bearers of Protestant principles and to lay down a rule and measure, with which unless all Protestants comply, they are to be held untrue to their principles, to be a proper attribute of this association, judged by its leaders in Ontario. I have spoken of Quebec. Now, in that Province there have been, for a long time, some persons—some persons only, I am glad to say—who have striven to create that *régime* in favour of their own party, who have insisted on extreme pretensions as to the rights of the clergy to use their influence in elections; who have sought to drag the clergy into the political arena; who have sought to pervert certain general language, which was used by the authorities of the Church, from its true sense and to turn it to the condemnation of one political party; who have sought to maintain the view that the clergy should refuse the rites of the Church to persons on account of their votes; who have sought to repeal the law as to undue influence, as far as it affected the clergy; and there can be no doubt that these efforts on the part of some persons in Quebec met, in the past, with a measure of success. Pressure was used in several counties against the candidate of one political party, as Liberal Catholics; and the struggle was severe, and resulted in a great weakening of that party, from which it has not even yet recovered. The members of that party appealed, under these circumstances to three tribunals; they appealed to public opinion, to the highest courts of the land, and to the highest authorities in their own church. They fought a long and arduous fight, which reached its climax, perhaps, in the period from 1875 to 1881. Public opinion, one of the tribunals to which they appealed, was aroused to a considerable degree in the Province of Quebec; and many Protestants there even changed their political views and left the party with which they had usually acted, because they felt this pressure was a pressure foreign to the proper sphere of religion and the proper sphere of the Church. The members of that party appealed also to the law; and the law was vindicated in several cases. They appealed also to the highest authorities in the Church, and those authorities also

interfered. We know well, for it is public to us, what was done. We know that, in 1876, an instruction was sent out from the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office in these words :

"The Bishops of Canada must be made to understand that the Holy See fully acknowledges the extreme gravity of the facts reported by them; and the injury caused by these facts to the authority of the clergy and the holy ministry is particularly to be deplored.

"Wherefore, in order to make up for these great injuries, it is especially necessary to root out the evil. Now, the cause of such great inconveniences lies in the fact that these Bishops are divided among themselves, both as regards the political question and as regards other questions which are now agitated in Canada. Therefore, with a view to putting an end to these much to be regretted dissensions, it will be necessary that the Bishops, together with His Lordship the Apostolic Delegate who has been sent to Canada, concert with each other to determine a uniform policy to be followed by all and each of them with regard to political parties.

"Another cause of these same inconveniences lies in their too great interference in political affairs, without enough of heed for pastoral prudence. The proper remedy for this excess of zeal is to remind these Bishops of that which has already been recommended to them by this Supreme Congregation on Wednesday, the 29th of July, 1874, to the effect that on the occasion of political elections they should conform in their advice to electors to what had been enacted in the Provincial Council of 1868.

"It must be added that the Church, while condemning Liberalism, does not intend to strike each and every political party which might chance to be called *Liberal*, since the decisions of the Church only apply to errors which are opposed to Catholic doctrine, and not to any specified political party whatever, and that consequently whoever without any other foundation declares that one of the political parties of Canada, namely, the party called the *Reform* party, a party heretofore strongly supported by some Bishops, is condemned by the Church, whoever makes such a statement acts wrongfully.

"Finally, as to what concerns the main subject of the doubts propounded; in order to determine what measures should be taken as regards Catholics, who, by reason of a pretended undue interference of the clergy in political elections, appeal to the civil courts, it is impossible to lay down a general rule for the Bishops on this subject, and therefore it will be the duty of whoever is in charge to provide in each case, with respect to the consciences of persons making such appeals. Therefore, let the Bishops take the necessary measures to guard the honour of the clergy, taking special care to prevent as much as possible clergymen from being obliged to appear before lay Judges.

"Lastly, Bishops must be exhorted to observe the greatest reserve with regard to political affairs, by reason, especially, of the danger there would be of provoking a violent war against the Church on the part of Protestants, who are already restless and irritated against the clergy under pretence of undue interference in political elections. Besides the clergy must be brought to always avoid naming persons from the pulpit, still much more so if it is to discredit them on the occasion of elections, and never to make the influence of the ecclesiastical ministry subservient

to private purposes, except when candidates might become antagonistic to the true interests of the church."

Now, Sir, that was followed up by the pastoral letter and circular which were issued after the arrival of the Delegate Apostolic, and after an understanding had been reached with him in 1877. The pastoral letter of 1877 contains the following passages :

"The gravity of the events which have taken place since the last general election, and the numerous and various difficulties to which they have given occasion, make it Our duty to remind you briefly, Our Most Dear Brethren, of the principles and the rules of policy which were expounded to you before now, in Our Councils, Our Circulars, and Our Pastorals, and particularly in that of the 22nd of September 1875."

"The Ninth Decree of the Fourth Council, held in 1868, expounds your duties as electors in the following terms:— 'Let the pastors instruct with great care the faithful on their duties in election times; let them strongly impress on their minds that the same law which confers on citizens the right of suffrage imposes on them at the same time the very serious obligation to give their votes whenever it is necessary, and always to vote according to their consciences, under the eye of God, and for the best interests of religion and of their country; that consequently the electors are always bound in conscience, before God, to give their suffrages to whatever candidate they believe to be truly honest and able to fulfil well and faithfully the important duties which devolve upon him, to be ever attentive to the welfare of the Church and State and to work faithfully to promote and guard the welfare of the Church and State.'"

Then, after pointing out what had been done in 1873 and 1875, and giving a warning against the doctrines *Catholico-Liberales*, the pastoral goes on to say :

"Unfortunately, and against our intention, some persons were inclined to see in this document an abandonment of principle, to come down to persons and political parties. Our wish has been to expound to you the true doctrine on the constitution and the rights of the Church, on the rights and the duties of the clergy in society, on the obligations of the Catholic press, and on the sanctity of an oath; such has been our only aim, and such is still our intention. In this we have followed the example of the Holy See who, in condemning Liberal Catholicism has refrained from naming persons and political parties. In fact there does not exist any Pontifical Act condemning any political party whatever; all the condemnations which have up to the present time emanated from this venerable source are only applicable to Liberal Catholics and to their principles, and the brief addressed to one of us in September, 1876, must be interpreted in that sense. Following the example of the Sovereign Pontiff, and in accordance with the wise prescription of our Fourth Council, we leave to each one of you to judge, under the eye of God, which are the men to whom these condemnations apply, whatever may be the political party to which they belong."

Now, Sir, at the same time, as I have said, a circular letter was issued to the

clergy, from which I will read an extract or two :

"In analysing the ninth decree of the Fourth Council, and the eighteenth of the Fifth, we find that the clergy must confine themselves to instructing the people as to their duties in election time; which duties are the following:—1. To give their votes when sufficient reasons call for it. 2. To vote according to their consciences, and under the eye of God, and to give their support to the candidates whom they may prudently judge to be truly honest and able to discharge the duties of a representative, which are to watch over and procure faithfully the welfare of religion and of the state. 3. Not to sell their votes. 4. To avoid intemperance, slander, and perjury."

Another passage reads thus :

"When you shall have so explained to your people the principles which ought to guide them in their choice, leave to the conscience of each of them the option of applying them to persons and to parties. And whenever a penitent shall tell you that he has voted in all conscience and under the eye of God, never call in question his good faith, and put into practice the well-known axiom: the same belief must be given to what the penitent says on his own behalf as to what he says against himself."

Then again, Sir, the letter says :

"The decree of the Fourth Council forbids you to teach from the pulpit, or otherwise, that it is a sin to vote for such and such a candidate, or for such and such a political party. With much more reason is it forbidden to you to announce that you will refuse the Sacraments for that cause."

"Never give your individual political opinion from the pulpit."

"Never attend any political meeting, and never make a public speech on such matters without the permission of your ordinary."

"If you have a right to vote you may avail yourself of it; but let it be with a prudence and without ostentation. It is proper that you should choose the most favourable opportunity for voting and not wait till last the moment, when the excitement is always greater, and that you should not remain near the place where the election is taking place."

"To those who may come to consult you privately, answer with prudence and calmly, without entering into discussions, which would be compromising to your character; for you know well that language the most innocent and the most true is exposed to be at such times misunderstood, misinterpreted and misreported. And even if you see that people are greatly excited, it will be prudent on your part to state simply that what you have said from the pulpit must be sufficient to guide them."

Well, Sir, these documents to which I have referred contain; I may say, some observations in which I think the pastors of the Roman Catholic Church set an admirable example to the pastors of the other churches; I mean particularly those injunctions against selling the suffrage, against bribery, against corruption, against intemperance, against calumny and against perjury. Then we go further. I do not confine myself wholly to

the statements made by these ecclesiastical dignitaries. About the same time, a discussion was raised in this Parliament; and I wish to show that the views which are reprehended by these documents are views which were not held by all the Roman Catholics even of the Conservative party. On the 11th February, I think, in the year 1877, Senator Masson, then a member of this House, used these expressions :

"Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says in his letter that the party with which I act was controlled by a power which declared that free thought was a cardinal sin. Well, Sir, I say that this is no more nor less than a slander on the Conservative party, and as a Conservative and an Ultramontane, as I am called by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, from the Province of Quebec, as the leader of the Ultramontanes, I say that the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, and I speak advisedly, are ready to give the clergy of the Province, on religious questions, that submission and that confidence which, according to our creed, we are obliged to give them; and regarding questions relating to the material progress of the country, and the political affairs of the country, we are ready, and shall always be ready, to give to the opinions of these gentlemen that respect to which they are entitled, owing to their high intelligence, their great virtue and their disinterestedness, but we are not ready to give any more."

Well, the matter was not finally settled. Notwithstanding what had been said, the discussion went on. Still the question was raised, and raised in pretty influential quarters,

ON THE PART OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

in Quebec, with reference to the law as to undue influence; and I felt it my duty—thinking the question might become a serious one, and desiring to place myself on record, and as I might by my voice in some degree influence my fellow-countrymen—to speak upon the subject myself; and I did so at the village of Teeswater, in the year 1877. From that speech I may be permitted to quote :

"Another demand of a very different character has been made from very high quarters, namely, that we should alter the law as to undue influence. Now, the basis of our representative institutions is that our elections shall be free. Each of us is called on to surrender his share of control over the common affairs to the majority, upon the ground that this surrender is necessary, for so only can we reach a decision; but also on the hypothesis, without which the demand would be quite unjustifiable, that, all having a common interest, and each man speaking freely for himself, the view of the majority is more likely to be sound—is more likely accurately to represent what would be beneficial to the community than the view of the minority. This is the ground-work."

"Now, that ground-work wholly fails if the vote be not the expression of the voter's own opinion, but

the expression of somebody else's opinion different from his. If, instead of its being his opinion, it be the opinion of his employer, his landlord, his creditor, or his minister, why it is not his vote at all, it is somebody else's, and we have not submitted ourselves to the free voice of our fellow-countrymen, but possibly to the voice of a very small minority, who have determined what the voice of the larger number is to be. Thus the whole basis of our representative institutions would be destroyed if we permitted the opinions of our employers, creditors, landlords or ministers to be forcibly substituted for our own. For this reason, besides the penalties which are enacted against the exercise of undue influence, we have declared that the vote of any man so unduly influenced shall be null and void, and that elections carried by such undue influences shall be annulled. I cannot, if a landlord, say to my tenant: 'Now, tenant, I shall turn you out at the end of your term if you do not vote for my candidate.' Though I may have a legal right to turn him out at the end of the term, yet I cannot give the intimation that I will, on this ground, exercise this right. If I do, the vote is annulled as not free. I cannot, if a creditor, say to my debtor: 'I will exact that debt at once if you do not vote as I wish,' though I may have a legal right to exact my debt. I cannot, if an employer, say to an employee: 'You shall leave my employment at the end of the current term unless you vote with me,' though the law may not oblige me to retain him in my service. It has been found necessary in all these cases to prevent the relations to which I have referred from being made the means of unduly influencing the vote, in order that this great cardinal principle of our Constitution—the freedom of each man to vote according to his own opinion—may be preserved intact. True, the landlord, and the creditor, and the employer, have each the right to speak and persuade by arguments; and the confidence placed in them may be such that the voter's opinion may be changed; but between the argument, the persuasion, the confidence which may conduce to a change in the mind and opinion of the voter, and that coercion which compels him to vote contrary to his mind on the threat of some loss or penalty, there is a broad and palpable distinction, and that is the distinction which the law lays down. Now, if there be a form of religion under which the minister is supposed to have the power, by granting or refusing certain rites, or by making certain declarations, to affect the state of the voter after death, is it not perfectly obvious that the threat of such results to the voter unless he votes in accordance with the opinion of the minister, might be infinitely more potent than any of the other threats I have named—of the exaction of a debt, the ejection of a tenant, or the discharge of an employee? And would not such a threat be obnoxious to just the same objection?

"I am far, indeed, from implying that politics should not be handled on Christian principles. Whatever difficulties and differences there may be as to Christian dogma, there is, fortunately, very little difference concerning Christian morals. We are, fortunately, all united in this country in the theoretical recognition—however far we may fail in practical observance—of the great doctrines of Christian morality which are handed down to us in the Gospels; and I believe it is on the basis of those doctrines that the politics of the country should be carried on. Dim indeed would be our hopes, and dark our expectations for the future, if they did not embrace the coming of that glorious day when those principles shall be truly, fully and practically recog-

nized; if we did not look forward to the fulfilment of promises that the 'kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of the Lord;' and that 'nation shall not make war against nation, neither shall they learn war any more;' if we did not watch for the time when the human law of self-interest and hate shall be superseded by the Divine law of self-sacrifice and love. But while we hope and strive for the accomplishment of these things, we must not forget the lessons of the Great Teacher and Exemplar. When interrogated upon secular things, when asked as to rendering tribute to Cæsar, He said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.' He laid down the principle, and he left the people—the querists—to make the application. So again when he was called upon to settle a dispute between two brothers about an inheritance, He said: 'Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?' Such was the view He took as to the duty of a minister, as to the work of the pulpit; and while I do not hesitate to say that to all ministers I would freely accord the right as citizens of voting, of expressing their opinions, of arguing and persuading and influencing if they please, my own opinion is that the pastor of a flock divided on politics will be much more likely to retain the fullest confidence of all the members of that flock, and so discharge effectually his great task, if he abstains from active interference in those political affairs on which there is and will be great divisions of opinion among them. But, Sir, it has been argued in some quarters that the free exercise of one form of religion amongst us is impaired by this law. That would, indeed, if true, be a serious thing. But, if it were true, we would still be bound, in my opinion, to preserve the fundamental principle of the freedom of the elector. No man, any article of whose creed should make him a slave, would be fit to control either his own destiny or that of free men. A slave himself, he would be but a proper instrument to make slaves of others. Such an article of religion would, in a word, be inconsistent with free institutions, because it would not permit that liberty of opinion in the individual which is their very base and corner stone. But we are not confronted with that difficulty. The public and deliberate utterances of high dignitaries in more than one Province of Canada have shown that the assertion is unfounded, and have recognized the right of every elector to vote according to his conscience; and the recent statement—communicated to the public through Lord Denbigh—of the head of that Church shows that the United Kingdom, where the law as to undue influence is precisely the same as ours, is perhaps the only country in Europe where the professors of that religion are free to practise it. If this be the case in the United Kingdom, it is so here; and it is not true that there is any form of religion, the free and full exercise of which is impaired by the preservation of the great principle to which I have referred. I trust, then, that the ill-advised pretensions which have been set up will be abandoned; but should they be pressed, I take the opportunity of declaring that for myself, whatever be the consequences, I shall stand by the principle which I have laid down and shall struggle to preserve, so far as my feeble powers permit, to each one of my fellow-countrymen, whatever his creed, the same full and ample measure of civil freedom which he now enjoys under those laws which enable him and me, though we may be of diverse faiths, to meet here on the same platform, and here to differ or agree according to our own

political convictions, and not according to our religious faith or the dictation of any other men, lay or clerical."

Now, Sir, finally, in September, 1881, there was a further communication dealing with these two subjects to which I have referred, and from it I shall trouble the House with a very brief extract. It is a communication from the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, Cardinal Simeoni:

"It has come to the knowledge of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda that in your Province certain members of the clergy and of the secular body continue to interfere too much in political elections, by using either the pulpit or newspapers and other publications.

"It is equally known to the aforesaid Sacred Congregation that a certain suffragan of Your Lordship now endeavours to appeal to Parliament to cause the electoral law concerning the so-called undue influence to be amended.

"Now, as regards the first point, I hasten to remind Your Lordship that as far back as the year 1876 the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office issued the following instruction:"

And then follows the instruction which I have already quoted. The communication proceeds as follows:

"In conformity with this instruction Your Lordship must without delay make known to all your suffragans, to the clergy, and to all those whom it may concern, that it is the intention of the Holy Father that all the aforesaid prescriptions of the Holy Office be strictly observed.

"As regards the second point, Your Lordship must notify all the suffragans that each of the prelates individually must refrain from agitating or causing to be agitated the question of the amendment of the law concerning the said undue influence. If there should come a time when the Bishops assembled should judge unanimously that the proper period had come to make the aforesaid demand, they must first apply to the Sacred Congregation to receive from it their proper instructions."

And that, as far as I know, was the final settlement of that controversy, so far as concerned the views of the highest authorities of the Church, repeated after an interval of years. During that controversy, on the twentieth of January, in the year 1876, the Archbishop of Toronto addressed a public letter to my hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), which, dealing as it does with this subject, may appropriately be read at this time. It is as follows:

"TORONTO, 20th January, 1876.

"HON. A. MACKENZIE,

"Premier of the Dominion of Canada.

"HON. AND DEAR SIR,—I think this an opportune time to inform you and your Government that priests in our Archdiocese are strictly forbidden to make the altar or pulpit of their churches the tribune of political harangues for or against any party or candidate

for election, or to threaten any spiritual disability for voting with either party.

"Priests may, of course, instruct their people on the conscientious obligation of voting for the candidate whom they judge will best promote the interests of the country, of taking no bribes, and of conducting themselves at the elections in a loyal and peaceful manner; but they are not to say to the people from the altar, that they are to vote for this candidate and reject the other.

"It would be very imprudent in a priest whose congregation is composed of Liberals and Conservatives to become a warm partisan of either political party.

"It would neutralize his influence for good in too many instances, and a priest requires all he possesses to forward the interests of his whole congregation.

"It is true that a priest, in his ordination, does not renounce his rights of citizenship; nor does he receive authority to impose on his congregation his own particular views of politics.

"The Catholic Church asks no special favour from any party. Her existence is independent of both. She asks only that her people be put under no unjust restraint or ban. It is true that the old legislation of England made the Catholic religion a bar to political and almost social existence; and though wiser counsels now prevail in Courts and Parliaments, yet some of the Protestant populace, and an occasional statesman in his individual capacity, so long educated in the traditions of the past, retain a deep-rooted prejudice and suspicion, not easily conquered, that the Catholic religion should be a bar to preferment and that the Catholic Church is inimical to free institutions and unfavourable to State rights. This is still a reproduction of the old Pagan cry: 'The Christians to the beasts,' or the old Jewish accusation: 'We have found this man perverting our nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar.'

"The Catholic Church asks only liberty to do good, and to be untrammelled by unjust laws in the exercise of her divine rights. I might here remark, that when in a free country religious and sacred rights are brought into the arena of politics, then the Catholics have to follow them to the polls and contend there for their rights, as in the case of education. We believe that parents have a perfect right to educate their children as they please. 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.' Hence, when the Catholics of Lower Canada conceded the right of separate education to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, the Catholic minority of Upper Canada claimed the same right, but had to contend for this right at the elections; and thus religious questions are dragged out of their sphere. The Catholic does not permit his religion to hinder the progress of the country, or the peaceful exercise of a different religion to his neighbours. When his religious principles are safe, the Catholic, under the impression that party government is a lesser evil, gives his support to that which he thinks will perform its duties for the greater good of the country and the happiness of the people.

"I am, Honourable Sir,

"Your very obedient servant,

"JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,

"Archbishop of Toronto."

As I have said, there was a long and bitter controversy in the Province of Quebec with

some who strove to abuse the power of the church in the way to which I have referred. That long and bitter controversy was a controversy in which my friends, the Liberals of Lower Canada, were the oppressed party, the party which was being overborne in it, which was suffering from it, in the constituencies; and though they have received justice at last in the particular to which I have referred, it is useless to disguise the fact that so long a conflict, waged in that manner, and with those weapons, has had a permanent weakening effect.

THE ATTITUDE OF ONTARIO ORANGEMEN AS TO QUEBEC DIFFICULTIES.

But I want to know where in all that time were the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario? I want to know whether they were helping in the cause which has thus been vindicated in the end. I want to know whether they were expressing and actively manifesting their sympathy with those who were struggling for the rights which have at length been accorded them. It is not so: it is known not to be so. It is true that many of the Protestants of Quebec came to the assistance of the Liberals of Quebec in that struggle, but the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario were unflinching in their support of, and in their consort with the very members who were waging that controversy against the Quebec Liberals. Why? Because they were united in political bonds with those members; because they rejoiced in their success at the polls, although that success was achieved against those with whom they professed to be in sympathy. They were kept in place and power by means of that partnership; and therefore they were untrue to the principles which they professed, and in order to promote which they are now saying they wish to be incorporated. I have declared my views on this subject, and I have nothing to recall in regard to them. I have shown where I am to be found in case any conflict may arise in which any church, whether Roman Catholic, or Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, or what you will, shall strive to encroach on what I believe to be the just domain of the State. I believe that, if you commit to any church absolute power and control over faith and morals, and if, at the same time, you commit to that church absolute and unlimited power to determine what is comprised within faith and morals, you concede necessarily to that church absolute power altogether; and I believe, therefore, that it is quite necessary to consider that

there may be a point at which we may be called on to consider what the tenets of the church in that particular point of view are. I have shown that the struggle was fought out within the Roman Catholic Church; that those rights on which the Liberals of Lower Canada insisted have been vindicated, and that the electors have a right to vote as free men. But should such a struggle recur, which God forbid, could I, judging from the past, hope for any assistance, could the Liberal party look with hope for any assistance, from the Orange Tory leaders of Ontario? No, because we have not received it in the past; and, whatever the views of these leaders, they subordinated them altogether to party politics, which led them to rejoice in the triumphs of those who were perpetuating principles directly opposed to their own.

THE ORANGE CLAIM TO SUPERIOR LOYALTY.

There are some other reasons which lead me to think that this society in Ontario is not a beneficial one. Its leaders claim a monopoly not merely of true Protestantism, but also of loyalty. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), at Winnipeg, said:

"One of his reasons was, that with three others he had opposed the Costigan resolution, which was a direct insult to the Mother Country, and to every loyal citizen in the country, except party leaders on both sides and members who were pandering to the Catholic vote, and not one member of the Orange society said, 'well done.'"

Grand Master Bennet said:

"You are no doubt aware that a most singular combination was formed at the last Session to defeat the Bill. We had the astounding spectacle of Protestant Liberalism and Ultramontanism in alliance to defeat it; Liberalism, because of the loyalty of Orangemen, and Ultramontanism, because of the advanced Protestantism of the Orange order."

There you have it, Sir, laid down as a rule, that Orangemen are so loyal, and their loyalty is so offensive to others, that the Orangemen must be put down by force. I maintain that that is an offensive statement, and that a secret society which devotes itself to the propagation of such opinions as these, as to the loyalty of others, is one which does not deserve favour or State recognition.

ORANGE ATTACKS ON THE LOYALTY OF ROMAN CATHOLICS.

There is another reason. These Ontario Orange leaders claim that their object is to advance Protestantism, and they claim to advance it by assertions with reference to the Roman Catholic Church which I believe

to be baseless. And here again I do not propose to deal with assertions as to dogma. I do not propose to deal with assertions with respect to religion, as to whether certain views are right or wrong, for we have nothing to do with them. But we have to do with their views as to the tenets of that church, as they affect the political condition and social order of the country. Those things are of material interest to us; and it is well that we should know what is advanced in the name of Protestantism, or with a view of promoting it, by the leaders of the Orange society in Ontario. In the *Sentinel* of December 21st, 1882, there is the following, which is headed "Allegiance to Rome only":

"We have always contended that the Romish Church teaches its followers to be disloyal to every State wherein it exists, to recognize the authority of no temporal Government, and to own allegiance only to the Papacy."

On April 26th, 1883, the same paper said:

"It is hardly necessary to say that every true member of the church must yield to the Pope, the infallible head of the church, unquestioning obedience in morals, dogmatic faith or belief, and also conduct and civil affairs.

"No member of the church can dispute the right of the head of it to decide infallibly and dogmatically all questions affecting temporal power in Governments, any more than he can that of the faith and belief put forth in her teachings.

* * * * *

"The people in America are governed by constitutions which leave to themselves the power of determining the character and structure of Government.

"These constitutions are, therefore, inimical to the Church of Rome, in her opinion, and are only tolerated because they cannot be destroyed. As she is at war with every form of Government not prescribed by herself, it would be her duty to destroy these constitutions if she could; nay, she would be guilty, under her teachings, if she had the power and did not destroy them.

* * * * *

"Is it not a humiliation that in a country like this a loyal association has been refused the same privileges that are daily granted to those who proclaim the prerogative of a foreign Prince Bishop to be superior to those of Her Majesty and Her Government—privileges daily granted to those whose civil allegiance is firstly to the Pope and secondly wherever he might direct it, though that should lead to the destruction of the dignities and prerogatives of the Imperial Crown now largely directed by the responsible Ministers of the Government, who hold office at the will of the people?"

Again in the *Sentinel* of the 8th of November, 1883, the following language is used:

"It is necessary to keep constantly before the mind of the Orange and Protestant public of the Dominion that Rome is still true to her motto, *semper eadem*.

"She is the same to-day that she was a hundred years ago, planning, scheming and contriving to subvert the best liberties and freest institutions of every State in Christendom."

These are the statements repeated over and over again as to the political attitude of the Church of Rome; and all true Protestants are called upon to occupy an inimical position toward members of that Church on the ground, first of all, that the adherents of that Church do not owe civil allegiance to the Queen of this Dominion and the Constitution of this country; second, that they owe civil allegiance to a foreign power; and third, that that power is inimical to free institutions, and that its efforts are directed to subvert them as far as possible. That is the attitude with respect to the Church of Rome and its adherents in Canada to-day. Again, so late as the 19th of February, 1884, at a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Ontario West, the Grand Master—while this Parliament was in Session, while this Bill was on the Order Paper—referring to the unfortunate affair in Newfoundland, said:

"Brethren, it is the old story. It has been told in Ireland a thousand times. It has been told in Fort Garry, Montreal and Newfoundland, and shows to us as plainly as the sun at noonday that when Romanism has the ascendancy Protestants have no rights and are only tolerated, and that the teachings of Rome are the same to-day as they were in '98—that to break faith with heretics is no sin, and that killing is no murder."

Then, Sir, in the same speech, he quotes approvingly from a weekly journal these words:

"It (i.e., the Orange body in Ireland) is acting strictly in self-defence for everybody who has read Irish history, or who listens to Fenian harangues, must know that from the moment when power passed into the hands of Irish Catholics no man of British blood or Protestant religion would ever dwell in safety on the soil of Ireland."

Commenting on that statement he says:

"This statement, coming from a gentleman who on more than one occasion has spoken in no friendly terms concerning our order, shows that the thinking Protestants of this country are becoming alive to the necessity of having a Protestant secret society to counteract the influence of the gigantic secret society of Romanism."

EFFECT OF THESE STATEMENTS, IF TRUE.

Now, these are statements with which we have to deal to-day. If these views be correct, if these be accurate statements of the tenets of that Church, then it does not merely hold erroneous views in matters of dogma. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and myself do not agree in our

religious views, and unfortunately we do not agree in politics; but our difference in religion does not mark the difference in our political allegiance. Our differences in religion are questions between us and our consciences, between us and our God, to be disposed of individually by each of us. But these other views, which I have just now read, are of an entirely different character; they go far beyond divergencies of religious opinion. We have here statements of views hostile to the Throne, hostile to free institutions, hostile to our Constitution, hostile to social order and safety; views which are destructive of everything which we, in Canada—and I do not place the Catholic below the Protestant—which we, as a united people in Canada hold most dear. I say that, if you tell me truly that in civil matters the adherents of the Roman Catholic faith do not owe allegiance to the Crown and the Constitution, but owe it to a foreign power, then they are not true subjects to the Queen, they are aliens in the midst of our land. If this be so I say that you cannot trust them, and I agree with those gentlemen who sometimes, as was mentioned this evening, say harsh things until “they grant absolution before the elections.” I agree with them that if these are the tenets of that Church, I can well understand their hostility, from a political point of view, to the Roman Catholic religion. If they believe that that Church is hostile to and desires the subversion of our free institutions, of our Constitution, I can understand their hostility going far beyond differences as to dogmas of religion; I can understand that the institution is one with whose adherents no alliance is to be maintained. Once again, if it is their opinion, and if it be the case, that Roman Catholics believe that no faith need be kept with a heretic, that the killing of a heretic is no murder, then social order and safety are at risk, and we cannot possibly remain at ease if such doctrines as these are theirs. All those who honestly believe these opinions to be true to the Roman Catholic faith or of the adherents of that faith could not possibly, if they are lovers of our Constitution and our institutions, honestly co-operate with them in politics. It is impossible, Sir, that an honest belief in these things, as the actual tenets of that Church, could consist with political co-operation on the part of those who so believe, with Roman Catholics. On the other hand, all lovers of free institutions should combine against the evil which would be wrought, the pressing evil and danger to our institu-

tions which would exist, if such indeed were the tenets held by such a large proportion of the citizens of this country. The question, then, is a serious one. We have it here; we have had it within the last few months; we have it stated as a doctrine of to-day, and the hon. gentleman even now nods assent to it, as the feeling an Orangeman holds with reference to his Roman Catholic fellow-citizens.

THE STATEMENTS ARE UNTRUE.

But are these statements true? Sir, I believe them to be untrue. I believe that the Church of Rome holds many religious doctrines and dogmas most gravely erroneous: to these I am entirely opposed.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You believe too much; that is the trouble.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, perhaps I believe too much. I will not state that the hon. gentleman believes all he says; I hope he does. I have endeavoured in my own poor way, and to the best of my humble ability, to promote the spread of those Protestant principles of dogmatic religion, those views of the Gospel and of the Bible, which I hold. I am doing what I can in that direction, and have been for years; it is not much, but I have done what I could. I believe that a most potent factor in that direction is a greater union among the Protestant denominations, and I have always been desirous of seeing such a union accomplished for the better advancement of the Gospel, according to our views of it. I rejoice to see the evidence of a tendency towards that union, in the existence of those organizations in which ministers and people of various denominations mingle, forget their differences, and learn what is best in each other, and in what points they agree. I rejoice to see Evangelical Alliances, Young Men's Christian Associations and Ministerial Associations, such as the one that exists in my own city. I have worked with Orangemen in the Synod of my Church and elsewhere; they have sympathized with me, and I have sympathized with them, I cared not for our differences in politics: they have never made the shake of our hands less warm, or our co-operation in the work of our church less earnest; and it pains me that hon. gentlemen opposite should seek an occasion of this kind to raise a wall of division, even among those engaged together in church work, by uttering and circulating these calumnies against me, and by declaring that my Protestant principles are abandoned because I cannot in my conscience support a Bill for the incorpora-

tion of a society which propagates opinions like those which I have read. I know that

I SHALL BE MISREPRESENTED AND MISUNDERSTOOD,

and that men will be misled, in my Province and elsewhere, as to what I have said to-night. I cannot help it: I felt it borne in upon me as a duty to say it: I had to say it. I know that men will be misled by designing politicians, who are using the cloak of religion and the cloak of charity to promote party politics. If we could forget our differences, and agree to mingle in all charitable works, irrespective of our faith—as, God be thanked, although we differ in religion, we may agree in works of charity—it would be a blessed achievement. But to-day what are we doing? You are promoting these calumnies in reference to another church; you are coming forward and declaring, untruly as I believe, that the tenets of that church, from which you differ, are in these respects detestable, and that every true Protestant must take the same position. It is a course of which I hope you will repent before you are many years older. Now, I am anxious for a Protestant ascendancy of one kind—for the spread of those opinions which I believe to be true; but I am anxious that there should be no Protestant ascendancy of the material kind to which the leaders of the Orange Tory party refer, when they speak of that Protestant ascendancy which existed in the past in Ireland, and to which they look backward with such longing eyes. I am not anxious for that kind of Protestant ascendancy, and in my desire to promote my dogmatic faith I do not countenance such weapons as the hon. gentleman and other Orange leaders use. My belief is that my Catholic fellow-subjects do acknowledge allegiance and feel a loyalty to the Crown and the free institutions of this country. My belief is that they do not think that to break faith with a heretic is no sin, and that to kill him is no murder. I have not forgotten the declaration made against such calumnies as these by the Irish prelates, as long ago as the twenty-fifth of January, 1826, in a document which contains many statements of faith and doctrine, as to which Protestants and Roman Catholics are as wide as the poles asunder. But it contains two statements which touch our social and political system, and our relations to each other as citizens of one common country, as follows:

“The Irish Catholics swear that the Catholics of Ireland do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or

any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, hath, or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: and this without any mental reservation or dispensation.”

The prelates go on to say:

“After this full, explicit and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing towards our Most Gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance.”

And with reference to the other insulting charge they say this:

“The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare on oath that they detest as unchristian and impious the belief, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatever under the pretence of their being heretics; and also the principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics.”

There you find distinct statements which contradict allegations which ought not to have been made, and which there ought not therefore to have been necessity for contradicting; and yet, Sir, we find, not ten years ago, not five years ago, not one year ago, but within the past few days, the most offensive of these allegations repeated, allegations which I have shown would, if true, indicate a condition subversive of the free institutions of our country. Now I am not prepared to mark as murderous, as treacherous and disloyal, nearly one-half of my fellow-citizens. I do not believe that the cause of Protestantism, of true religion, the advancement of the Gospel, the peace and prosperity, the welfare and the good government of this Dominion, will be promoted by the State recognition of this secret society, organized and led as it is in Ontario, and devoted to the propagation of views such as those which I have exposed. I do not myself attach, in the discordant dissolution of parties with respect to this Bill, any political significance to the question. I have viewed it from another aspect altogether; I have been anxious that we should understand what the real merits of the controversy are; and in my statement of my objections I have endeavoured to sustain them, not by stale and musty authorities, but by recent and authentic utterances. But, perhaps, I am wrong; I dare say that I shall be more bitterly misrepresented than ever before by the Orange Tory leaders; and as to the Tory Roman Catholic leaders, they, too, the temporary struggle between them and their Orange allies being ended and the alliance revived, will regard me all the more distastefully because I have

necessarily shown, either how sham their battle is, or how false and unnatural is their conjunction.

THE TRUE POLICY DEFINED.

But I have this satisfaction, that I have told plainly the truth as I believe it ; and it will be an ample reward to me, if I have succeeded in explaining to moderate men on both sides the views I hold, and in pointing out the true path of duty in a community of diverse

races and creeds like ours ; where we must combine firmness in the assertion of our own rights, with fulness in the recognition of the right of others ; we must cultivate moderation and forbearance ; we must avoid misrepresentation, calumny and abuse ; we must hold to the ample acknowledgment of each man's individual rights of conscience in religious matters, and of the common citizenship of all in civil affairs, if we would make of Canada a great and free country, inhabited by a happy and united people.

HON. EDWARD BLAKE'S SPEECH ON THE MOTION CON- DEMNING THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE EXE- CUTION OF LOUIS RIEL, MARCH, 1886 (CONDENSED).

Mr. BLAKE said, in the course of his remarks . . . I entirely agree that, while the case is one for our consideration, the discussion is of a delicate character, dealing as it does with the administration of justice. It is a case in which I believe

WE OUGHT ABSOLUTELY TO ESCHEW ALL
SPIRIT OF PARTISANSHIP,

in which we ought, as far as possible, to eliminate from our minds all spirit, even of party, and which we ought to approach as nearly as we may with the calmness, the dignity, and the impartiality of the judge. This is always a difficult task for a political body, and therefore a task rarely to be attempted—to be attempted only under that pressure of necessity which rests upon us to-day. But it is a task peculiarly difficult on the present occasion, because of those questions of race and creed which have been drawn into the discussion; because of the old offence, which has been made, rightly or wrongly, a part of the question under consideration; and because also of the question of the responsibility of the Government itself in connection with the outbreak which gave rise to the trial which resulted in the sentence which the Government ordered to be executed. But, Sir, though I quite recognize the special difficulties which surround us in approaching this our task, in the spirit in which it ought to be approached, I conceive that the existence of those difficulties only makes the adoption of that spirit the more imperative, and that *our duty is, so far as the interests of truth and justice will allow,*

TO SAY NO WORD THAT MAY IRRITATE,

and as far as possible, to take a course which may heal old sores—and new sores, too.

I have the honour to occupy, however unworthily, the position of leader of the Liberal party; and with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to that position, I took at the earliest practicable moment, after

my return to the country, the opportunity of declaring publicly, what I conceived ought to be and was the attitude of that party towards this question. I have since enforced by argument on all occasions, the view that that was our true attitude; and I repeat to-day, in the presence of this Parliament, the declaration I then made, that upon this subject there has not been, nor is there intended to be, the slightest association of party in our ranks,—that of set purpose and in the belief that we shall so best discharge our duty to our country, we have agreed that each one of us shall, after listening to the arguments and coming to such conclusion as we can, vote as he conceives, entirely irrespective of party alliances, the interests of his country demand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Hon. gentlemen opposite cheer derisively. I understand them perfectly; they cannot conceive of such an act. It is

INCREDIBLE TO THEM THAT PUBLIC MEN

should so act, and I do not feel moved at all by their cheers, knowing as I do, from eighteen years' experience, their manner of conducting business. But what I say is true, for all that: and so, upon this occasion,

I MUST SPEAK, NOT AT ALL IN MY CAPACITY
OF LEADER OF A PARTY, BUT AS AN
INDIVIDUAL FOR MYSELF ALONE.

I have said that I believe that there are materials very important to a satisfactory discussion of this question, which materials the Government have not thought fit to bring before us. I say we ought to have had an opportunity of seeing some of the papers which have been brought down and which we have not yet seen, because we know that unprinted papers are accessible to but few. For my part, I have not yet had the opportunity of seeing a single paper brought down by the Government so far, with the exception of the instructions to the Crown counsel of which I

obtained a copy. There are important papers, so far as I am able to gather from statements made by the Minister when presenting from time to time those which he did bring down, which are not yet brought down, and some, as I shall show before I resume my seat, very important. I think the

CONDUCT OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON THE QUESTION OF THE PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

is blamable in the extreme. They use these papers as a fund upon which they can draw, so far as they think them advantageous to themselves in the conduct of the discussion; but such papers as they think do not tell in their favour, they hold back. The Government select such papers as they think they can make a point on in the debate. These they bring down at the moment they want to use them, but the *mass of papers on the perusal of which, if they had been placed in an accessible form before us, a proper general judgment could be reached, these they refuse to bring down.* They say they have no time to bring them down, that they have no time to do anything else but to debate this question from day to day, and have time only to bring down those papers which serve their own arguments. I said the other day, and I repeat, that in my opinion the whole question of

THE CONDUCT OF THE GOVERNMENT,

before the rebellion, and up to the outbreak, and the whole attitude and relation of the half-breeds and white settlers to the Government with reference to the various questions which have been agitated, are extremely material to the formation of a judgment upon this question. We are doing a wrong thing: we are

PUTTING THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE

when we discuss first of all the final act in the great drama, instead of dealing in the first instance with those precedent facts and circumstances, threshing them out, sifting them, and endeavouring to reach a conclusion as to the relative responsibilities and attitudes of the Government of the country and of the people who rose. I say that we ought to know that in order that we may properly measure what the moral guilt was of those who rose, we ought to know in order that we may properly measure what was the right of this Government to act as judge in this cause. And, therefore, Sir, I am of opinion that the course which the Government has

decided and insisted upon being pursued in this matter is an inconvenient, an illogical, an unsatisfactory course. I think also that it must be thoroughly understood—and we may as well understand it now—that, if we are to put the cart before the horse, we shall have to deal with the horse a little later.

I have stated in a speech which was but, after all, a chronological recital of the actions on the one side and of the other, my view upon the evidence which was then presented, of the relations of the Government to the North-West, to the white settlers, and to the half-breeds in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert and elsewhere; and I have declared, and I think I have proved, that there were in those matters

GROSS, PALPABLE, INCREDIBLE DELAY, NEGLECT AND MISMANAGEMENT.

I have held, and I hold this Government responsible for every dollar of the public and private treasure which has been expended, for every pang that has been inflicted, for every life that has been lost, whether on the field or on the scaffold in the North-West, and I believe that for this, their responsibility, they will be called to a strict and stern account, here first, and afterwards at the great tribunal, so soon as they, who so boldly challenge us to come on, choose to bring forward those papers which they hold within their vaults.

THE GUILT OF THE INSURGENTS.

Now, with reference to the insurgents, of course there was legal guilt—of course, rebellion, the old saying is, is always treason until it becomes revolution. *The degree of moral guilt is not a question for the jury at all; it is a question to be considered when you come to award the punishment. It does not affect in the slightest degree either the verdict of the jury or the sentence of the court.* Riel was legally guilty, no matter how great, and pressing, and long endured the grievances may have been; no matter how strong the case may have been, *Riel was legally guilty; no matter what the moral justification or the moral palliation or excuse may have been,* Riel, and those who rose with him, were legally guilty of the crime of treason, *if they were mentally responsible.* The Crown in the course of this trial, *stopped the evidence about the grievances, and they stopped it—I make no complaint of their conduct—they stopped it rightly, because it was no defence at law, because it was utterly impossible, as the Crown counsel observed, that the court*

which sits under the authority of this Parliament and of this Government, could permit evidence to be taken to show that treason or rebellion against this Government was a justifiable thing. There was then, Sir, upon this trial before the jury, complicity with and a lead in the insurrection being abundantly proved, and in fact practically admitted, the single question whether the prisoner should be found guilty, or whether he should be found not guilty, on the ground of insanity. Now, before dealing with that question, I wish to refer to some only of the incidents connected with the trial. I have expressed my regret at

THE CHOICE OF THE JUDGE

in this case. I have pointed out there were some difficulties in relation to any judge who might be appointed under the existing circumstances; that in the first place these stipendiary magistrates in the North-West were, in truth, inferior magistrates. They are not magistrates—I desire to speak of them with all due respect—but confessedly they are not magistrates in any sense of that weight, dignity, authority and standing which belong to those magistrates who, under the laws of the older Provinces of the Dominion, are entrusted with the trial of capital offences. I have pointed out, besides, that these judges are political officers, as members of the North-West Council, of that very North-West Council which shortly after these trials thought it within the sphere of its duty to pronounce an opinion—first of all, upon the conduct of the Government with reference to the transaction of its business, that portion of its business the neglect of which led to the insurrection or gave the opportunity for the insurrection; and secondly, to pass an opinion upon the course which ought to have been or the course which was pursued by the Government with reference to the execution of this very sentence. I have pointed out also that the standing of those officers in another important respect is inferior to that which ought to be the standing of men entrusted with such issues, in this: *That they are not officers holding their office during good behaviour; they are officers holding office practically during pleasure.* The security which grows from the

ENTIRE INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDGES

of the Executive Government does not subsist in this case, and the fact that it does not subsist has been emphasized by this Govern-

ment, which in a well-known case has removed one of those stipendiary magistrates from office. So that not merely in theory but *in practice has the lesson been taught that these judges are under the control of this Government.* Those difficulties in my opinion should have been removed by legislation. I do not think that Parliament as a whole, whatever the Administration may have done, really contemplated that trials for high treason or treason felony should take place before those magistrates. I do not suppose that in what we thought was happy, peaceful and contented Canada there was any one who thought of the possibility of a trial for high treason or treason felony. Speaking for myself, I say it never occurred to me that we should have such a trial last year or any year in our country; and I therefore say that I fancy it must have been upon that view very largely that the legislation which was passed by the late Government, and which was amended by the present Government in a direction which diminished to some extent the securities for the prisoner, was passed. You may say these are but theoretical difficulties after all. I say, No. I say they are serious practical difficulties. They are intensely practical. I have already said elsewhere that the question is not simply of the actual fairness of the trial. *It is of the last consequence that the public should retain all the securities which constitutional government and parliamentary government have wrested from the prerogative, and that there should be in the minds of the public a certain conviction that those securities exist and are available.* This is not a new question with us. Its spirit is exhibited in our Statute Book, in the Act which constitutes the Supreme Court, by which it is expressly provided that the judges of

THAT COURT SHALL NOT BE COMPETENT

to accept any commission or employment of emolument under the Government of the day. In the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada an express prohibition of a similar character exists. How was it that the law was engrafted on the Statute Book? Because it had been found of practical consequence to the people of the Province of Quebec that it should be so. There also, as we know, there had been an agitation against grievances of many years' standing, which culminated in the Rebellion of 1837; and for a great many years this question was one of the questions agitating the people of that Province. You will find that, as early as 1825, the resolutions

of the Legislative Assembly of Lower Canada declared as follows :

"That for the more upright and impartial administration of justice it is expedient to render the judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench and Provincial Courts more independent than hitherto by incapacitating the said judges from seats in the Executive and Legislative Councils, and disqualifying such as have now seats therein from sitting or voting in such Councils.

"That it is expedient to secure by law to the said judges their respective offices during good behaviour in the same manner as those officers are secured in England.

"That it will be expedient for the aforesaid to secure adequate permanent salaries to the said judges on their being prevented from holding any other office of profit or emolument under the Crown."

It is not, Sir, in the heyday of liberty that we are to forget the securities for freedom. The price—according to a hackneyed but ever-to-be-remembered maxim—the price of liberty is eternal vigilance ; and in this regard, as I have said, an error has been committed. Now, what is the measure and extent to which this Administration is chargeable in this respect ? Certainly not in the existing state of the law with reference to a trial before one of the stipendiary magistrates. All that can be complained of fairly against them is that their attention being called to the special circumstances of the case, to the unprecedented and unanticipated circumstances, during the late Session of Parliament, by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and the suggestion being made that legislation should take place, they declined to accede to the suggestion, and insisted that the trial should go on under the existing laws. Sir, I have said that trials of this description differ altogether from all other classes of trial in respect to the importance of the independence of the judiciary.

RELATION OF THE GOVERNMENT TO TRIALS FOR TREASON.

They differ wholly, because in trials of this description there is hardly a conceivable case in modern times, at any rate, in which the Government does not occupy a wholly different relation to the prosecution from that which it occupies in all ordinary cases in the administration of criminal justice. I refer to the well-known book of Lieber on Civil Liberty, when he uses these words :

"In the trial of treason the Government is no longer theoretically the prosecuting party, as it may be said it is in the case of theft or assault, but the Government is the really offended, irritated party, endowed at the same time with all the force of the Government to annoy, prosecute and often to crush. Governments have therefore been most tenacious in retaining

whatever power they could in the trial for treason ; and on the other hand it is most important for the free citizen that in the trial for treason he should not only enjoy the common protection of a sound penal trial, but far greater protection. . . . The trial for treason is a gauge of liberty. Tell us how they try people for treason, and we will tell you whether they are free.

"It redounds to the glory of England that attention was directed to this subject from early times, and that guarantees were granted to the prisoners indicted for treason centuries before they were allowed to the person suspected of a common offence.

. . . Experience proves that not only are all the guarantees of a fair penal trial peculiarly necessary for a fair trial in treason, but that it requires additional safeguards ; and of one or the other the following seem to me the most important.

"The judges must not depend on the Executive.

"The judges must not be political bodies" . . .

Many safeguards are specified, of which I select the two that are apposite to the present case : "The judges must not depend on the Executive. The judges must not be political bodies." Now, Sir, being in the difficulty that in these particular trials the Government, under the standing laws which they did not choose to propose to alter, had to select a judge who was dependent on the Executive—a judge who was one of a political body—it was

EMINENTLY INCUMBENT ON THEM TO HAVE MADE THE BEST SELECTION,

the one which was least objectionable, the one in respect of which it might be said, though there is a difficulty as to all to which I have adverted, this one is certainly the least, or at any rate not the most, obnoxious. But what I have objected to on a former occasion, an objection which I renew to-night, is the choice of the particular judge, because this particular judge, as you will see if you refer to the Public Accounts, was the recipient of special favours, the occupant of special relations to the Executive of the day. In the first place he is the legal adviser to the Executive of the North-West ; he is so appointed during the pleasure of the Government ; he is so paid a salary during the pleasure of the Government. He answers to the Attorney-General, the legal adviser of the Government in the North-West Territories ; and it needs not to enlarge upon the relations and responsibilities of a Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories to a rebellion in the North-West, and upon the relations and responsibilities of the First Minister of Canada, who declared that he was the medium of communication between the two Governments and of the Minister of the Interior towards the Lieutenant-Governor

of the North-West Territories to show that it was an unhappy choice to select, out of the three or four judges, the very person who filled the position of the political adviser, the political law officer, to the Government in the Territories, to be the judge in this particular trial. He is also the recipient of special favours. I find in the Auditor-General's Report, just brought down, a statement of his accounts. I find that, irrespective of his salary of \$3,000 a year, there has been paid to him, during the year to which these accounts refer, a special rental allowance of \$500, an additional salary as legal adviser to the Lieutenant-Governor of \$200, three votes of \$200 each as a nominative member of the North-West Council, his travelling allowance of \$1,000, and something between \$400 and \$500 for expenses and allowances for attendance at Ottawa in connection, it is said, with the Torrens Act—making a total of over \$2,700 paid during the last year to this judge in addition to his salary of \$3,000. Now as to travelling allowances, and allowances as nominative members of the North-West Council, the other judges were in the same position; but the allowances for house rent and as legal adviser and in connection with the Torrens Act are peculiar to the particular officer whom the Government, I think, extremely unfortunately, decided they would entrust with the duty of conducting these trials. Well,

THE JUDGE CHOOSES THE JURY PANEL,

and we have heard from the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) a statement, which I think is of considerable importance, and with reference to which I should have desired to hear something from the Government before now—a statement to the effect that there were persons of the faith and nationality of the prisoner eligible as jurymen, but that none or only one such was chosen of the panel. I heard the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) say that no objection of that description could apply, in consequence of the relations of the prisoner at the time of his trial to the Church of his fathers and the Church to which he himself belongs, but I do not think that argument holds; and for my part I must express my regret that, if the circumstances be as up to this moment they appear to be from the uncontradicted statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), a wider selection should not have been made of the panel; and I share the regret expressed by several hon. members that the single per-

son who happened to be on the jury of that faith should have been peremptorily challenged. For that challenge there may have been, for all I know, a good reason; but we are not told, and we must not presume it was a challenge for cause. We all know the shock to the administration of justice which ensued when those of his faith were challenged on the occasion of the O'Connell trial. That ought to have been a lesson on this occasion, and the same difficulty ought not to have recurred in our day. Again, with reference to

THE CHARACTER OF THE PROSECUTION.

The written instructions which were given to the Crown lawyers were to try all the leaders, with the exception of certain Indians and others who might be chargeable with murder—to try all the leaders for treason. No distinction whatever was made in those instructions between Louis Riel and the other leaders. Now, how did it happen under these circumstances that all the prisoners except Louis Riel were indicted—for the same offence, is true, but under the more modern statute and procedure for treason-felony, while Riel alone was tried for high treason under the ancient law? I pass, although there are other points to which I might refer, to the issue which I have said was for the jury to decide on that occasion, and that issue was,

NOT WHETHER RIEL WAS INSANE

in the sense in which, in common parlance, we use that word, but whether he was insane in the sense in which the word is so used that it may create irresponsibility for crimes. By our law, whether the law be right or wrong, *he might be insane in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word, and yet criminally responsible*; and the question for the jury was, in fact, whether he was so insane as, within the meaning of the law, to be irresponsible for his acts. This is a difficult question, as are all questions of insanity, and it may be divided into two headings: First, what was the effect if his conduct were genuine? And next, was it genuine or feigned? Now I want to fasten if I can upon your mind the question for the jury. I want you to remember that the question for the jury was whether he was insane within the meaning which the law attaches to that term, so as to induce the consequence of irresponsibility for crime, because it must be always remembered as the vital question, as

the vital point, that without disturbing in the slightest degree the finding of the jury, there may remain and generally will remain under circumstances like these important considerations as affecting the moral guilt, and therefore as affecting the degree of punishment to be awarded to the prisoner. The verdict then of guilty would be right, first of all, no matter how great were the faults of the Government, no matter how clearly political was the offence, no matter how great the grievances, no matter how long-enduring and long-suffering the people might have been, the verdict of guilty would be right no matter how these things might have been, and also the verdict of guilty would be right no matter how clearly Riel's intellect were disordered, if it were not disordered up to a certain point; and these two things, the question of the political character of the offence and the resultant considerations, and the question of the disorder of intellect, would fail to be considered, consistently with not disturbing in the least the verdict of guilty by the jury, in the award of punishment. Now, I shall make good after a little while by authorities those two propositions; but before touching the facts as to the mental condition of this individual, it may be as well to look for a moment at

THE GENERAL KNOWLEDGE ON THE SUBJECT
AND THE PRINCIPLES OF ENQUIRY.

[NOTE.—Here Mr. Blake gave numerous citations now omitted for the sake of brevity from medical and legal works showing the true view as to insanity, and the responsibility of the insane for acts against the criminal law, and the influence of persons more or less deranged.]

Sir James Stephen says :

“Diseases of the brain and the nervous system may in any one of many ways interfere more or less with will so understood. They may cause definite intellectual error, and if they do so their legal effect is that of other innocent mistakes of fact.

“Far more frequently they affect the will by either destroying altogether, or weakening to a greater or less extent, the power of steady, calm attention to any train of thought, and especially to general principles and their relation to particular acts. They may weaken all the mental faculties so as to reduce life to a dream. They may act like a convulsion fit. They may operate as resistible motives to an act known to be wrong. *In other words they may destroy, they may weaken or they may leave unaffected the power of self-control.*

“THE PRACTICAL INFERENCE FROM THIS SEEMS TO ME THAT THE LAW OUGHT TO RECOGNIZE THESE VARIOUS EFFECTS OF MADNESS. IT OUGHT, WHERE MADNESS IS

PROVED, TO ALLOW THE JURY TO RETURN ANY ONE OF THESE VERDICTS :

- “(1) GUILTY;
- “(2) GUILTY; BUT HIS POWER OF CONTROL WAS WEAKENED BY INSANITY;
- “(3) NOT GUILTY ON THE GROUND OF INSANITY.”

I once again call the attention of the House to the suggestion as to what the law ought to be, and I call attention to it because *I shall point out before I have done that this practical result of dealing with the second class of cases, namely, guilty, but his power of control was weakened by insanity, is achieved by other means to-day, namely, by the Action of the Executive.*

Again Mr. Stephen says :

“As to the verdict of not guilty on the ground of insanity, the foregoing observations show in what cases, in my opinion, it ought to be returned, that is to say in those cases in which it is proved that the power of self-control in respect of the particular act is so much weakened that it may be regarded as practically destroyed, either by general weakening of the mental powers, or by morbid excitement, or by delusions which throw the whole mind into disorder or which are evidence that it had been thrown into disorder by diseases of which they are symptoms, or by impulses which are irresistible and not merely unresisted.”

“The position for which lawyers have always contended as to insanity is that parts of the conduct of mad people may not be affected by their madness, and that if such parts of their conduct are criminal they ought to be punished for it. It may, however, be asked how ought they to be punished? *Ought they to be punished in all respects like sane people?* To this I should certainly answer, Yes, as far as severity goes; No, as far as the manner of punishment goes. The man who, though mad, was found guilty without any qualification of murder I would hang, but if the jury qualified their verdict in the manner suggested in respect of any offender I think he should be sentenced, if the case were murder, to penal servitude for life, or not less than say fourteen years, and in cases not capital to any punishment which might be inflicted on sane men.”

Now, Sir, having thus attempted to state, not in my own words, but in words which I think will be taken as those of the greatest authority, what are the doctrines of the law upon this subject, I propose to address myself for a brief space to what was the evidence in this particular case adduced at the trial as distinguished from other circumstances which might have been adduced. And first of all, the most important point in the case is this :

THE MAN HAD BEEN INSANE.

Unquestionably he had been insane. I say that is a most important point, and therefore it is first to be taken up. Dr. Roy, the medical superintendent of the Beauport

Lunatic Asylum, was examined, and the substance of his testimony was :

The prisoner was put in the asylum by the Quebec Government in June, 1876, and discharged January, 1878.

Dr. Roy, in discharge of his duty, studied his case and attended him. He was unquestionably insane at that time. The type was megalomania. The symptoms or prominent features are connected with religion, or power, pride and egotism. The patient cannot bear contradiction, and becomes irritated. There are delusions.

On ordinary subjects, and where not affected by the delusions, the patient seems to reason well, and may be clever. Riel had these symptoms, and was at that time of unsound mind, and incapable of controlling his acts.

The disease may disappear, or intermit and recur.

Riel was of sound mind when released.

The witness heard the evidence given by the witnesses as to Riel's words and conduct during his visit to the North West.

The symptoms were the same as he had witnessed himself in the asylum at Beauport, and he believed Riel was insane at the time in question.

Now, according to this statement, if we were to assume that that was to conclude the case, according to the opinion of Dr. Roy as to what his condition was during the Rebellion, I would infer the right to acquit him on the ground of insanity. BUT WHAT IS UNDISPUTED AND INDISPUTABLE IS, THAT THE MAN WAS INSANE FROM 1876 TO 1878, AND THAT THE SYMPTOMS HAD RECURRED IN THE YEAR 1885—THE SAME SYMPTOMS WHICH OCCURRED WHEN HE WAS UNQUESTIONABLY INSANE FROM 1876 TO 1878. Now there was more evidence on this subject which I want to refer to at another period; but I may say that what has been made very plain, though it was not proved on the trial, is that he had been in two other asylums, and I now refer to the

PROBABILITIES OF A RECURRENCE OF INSANITY.

Browne, in the "Medical Jurisprudence of Insanity," says :

"One circumstance must not be overlooked in connection with the durability of insanity, and that is that there is a tendency to recurrence even after complete restoration to health. Perhaps of 100 persons who have an attack of mania and recover from it fifty will, after such recovery, again become insane. After insanity has passed away there seems to exist a hyper-sensitive condition of mind which is ill-suited to carry on the rough intercourse of the world and its society. The man who has recovered is not so well as he was before he was taken ill. Disease always chooses the weak for its victims. The result then of these researches, which have been made into the intricacies of this subject, are these: *that of twelve persons attacked with insanity, six recover and six die sooner or later; that of the six who recover three only will remain sane during the rest of their lives, and that the recovery of the other three will not be permanent.*"

The result of that is, that once found it is that a man is unquestionably insane, the chances are three out of four either that he will continue insane till he dies, or, if he recovers, that recovery will be but temporary and he will once again become insane. Brown says again :

"It need scarcely be added that as recovery of health is gradual so must the recovery of responsibility or civil ability be also a matter of time. But as the law cannot recognise the minute distinctions which exist between to-day and to-morrow, it cannot recognise graduated responsibility, and it is only necessary to remember that this recovery of mental strength is gradual, that due allowance may be made for those persons who have recently suffered from an attack of mental disease, and that it is safe to regard such persons as still irresponsible for criminal acts and incapable of civil privileges, even although the recovery may seem complete, unless the contrary can be proved. Let the presumption be in favour of their want of capacity and the irresponsibility, and no injustice is likely to arise. At the same time this presumption is liable to be rebutted by proof of its opposite."

In the commission to which I have already referred Dr. Tuke, being examined, made these answers :

"The fact is certain that insanity constantly exists with long lucid intervals, and that it is more or less patent at different times.

"Q.—And that the patient fluctuates in a condition between what may be termed sanity and insanity, the line between which is not easily definable?—A. Yes; that is a constant form of what we call insanity with lucid intervals, or insanity with remissions, or recurrent insanity."

I do not think that too much importance can be attached to the circumstance of the unquestioned and

UNQUESTIONABLE INSANITY OF LOUIS RIEL

as proved by the facts to which I refer at this precedent time, and to the character of his alleged illusions or delusions, as you please to call them, at the later date. Having regard to the knowledge and experience we have with reference to the probability of recurrent insanity it seems to me these circumstances show that *he was labouring under insane delusions on religion and politics prior to and during the outbreak, and that these delusions were directly connected with the crime with which he was charged.* He believed himself a prophet, a priest, a religious potentate; he had visions; he had irrational ideas as to foreign policy, as to the lands and the division of them, as to other nationalities, as to religion, as to politics, as to his influence, as to his mission, and as to the Metis nation. Of these facts I think the evidence taken at the trial afforded abundant

testimony. I think it affords abundant testimony as to his condition anterior to the outbreak, and I have taken the evidence chronologically. Now, the evidence which was given by the priests as to his condition is to be accepted, with this observation—that if it were possible for any one to suppose that any course of conduct on his part could have influenced them to swerve from the accurate, honest truth—if it were possible, which I am the last to suggest, that such a thing could be, it is clear that they would not have been swerved in favour of this man, from whom they had suffered so much, who had cast aside their religion, who had profaned their churches, who had insulted themselves, who had assumed their position, who had led away their flocks, who they thought was instrumental, directly or indirectly, in the murder of two of their order, who had caused all the misery of the people in benefiting whom their whole lives had been spent—I say it is impossible to suppose that they could have been swerved in favour of this man by anything in the way of feeling; and at that time he had not recanted his religious errors. But they state not only opinions, but facts, and facts of the most important character.

FATHER ANDRE SAYS

on religion and politics he and Riel frequently conversed, against his will; because on these subjects *Riel was no longer the same man*; it seemed as if there were two men in him; he lost all control of himself on those questions. Twenty times he told Riel he would not speak on those subjects, because Riel was a fool, did not have his intelligence of mind; that was the witness's experience; he had the principle that he was an autocrat in religion and politics, and he changed his opinion as he wished; his ideas changed; to-day he admitted this, and to-morrow he denied it; he believed himself infallible; he would not allow the least opposition at all; immediately his physiognomy changed and he became a different man. Then comes a most important act. *All the priests met* and they discussed whether it was possible to allow Riel to continue in his religious duties, and they unanimously decided that he was not responsible on these questions; that he could not suffer any contradiction; that he was completely a fool in discussing these questions; it was like showing a red flag to a bull. Now, remember that these statements of Riel to Father Andre were made and this conclusion was reached long before the outbreak, and before,

as he says, Riel had actually risen against the priests. These erroneous ideas and these manifestations of irregularity of mind were during the latter part of 1884 and the early part of 1885, before the rebellion.

FATHER FOURMOND SAYS THAT HE

was present at this meeting of the priests, that it was he who raised the question; and he states the facts on which his view rested. He says: Before the rebellion it seemed as if there were two men in the prisoner; in private conversation he was affable, polite, pleasant and charitable; if contradicted on religion and politics he became a different man and would be carried away with his feelings; he would use violent expressions. As soon as the outbreak began he lost all control of himself; he often threatened to destroy all the churches. He had extraordinary ideas on the subject of the Trinity; *according to his ideas it was not God who was present in the Host, but an ordinary man, six feet high.* As to politics he wanted first to go to Winnipeg and Lower Canada and the United States, and even to France; and he said: "We will take your country even," and then he was to go to Italy and overthrow the Pope, and then he would choose another Pope of his own making; he said something to the effect that he would appoint himself as Pope. As the agitation was progressing he became a great deal more excitable; *at the time of the rebellion Father Fourmond thought him insane.* At one time when there was a gathering he kept following the witness into the tents and compelled him to leave the place and cross the water. There was a very extraordinary expression on his face; he was excited by the opinions he had expressed on religion. He said to the women: "Woe unto you if you go to the priests, because you will all be killed by the priests." All of a sudden, when the witness came to the boat, Riel came up with great politeness and said: "Look out, Father; I will help you to get on the boat." In an instant he passed from rage to great politeness. Once again at the Council the witness was brought up for trial; Riel was enraged, and called him a little tiger; but when the witness was leaving, he passed again from rage to extraordinary politeness, offered a carriage and took the witness's parcel and carried it for him.

THEN CHARLES NOLIN

(whose conduct seems to have been inconsistent and certainly unfriendly) says that

about a month after prisoner arrived, say the end of July, he showed him a book he had written in the States. The first thing there was to destroy England and Canada, and also to destroy Rome and the Pope. He said he had a divine mission to fulfil, and showed Bishop Bourget's letter, eleven years old, as proof. Riel showed him a book written with buffalo blood, the plan in which that was, after taking England and Canada, he would divide Canada, and give Quebec to the Prussians, Ontario to the Irish, and the North-West Territories he divided between the European nations. The Jews were to have a part, and the Hungarians and Bavarians. As to the money he wanted from the Government, he said if he got the money he wanted from the Government he would go wherever the Government wished to send him. He told Father André, if he was an embarrassment to the Government by remaining in the North-West, he would even go to the Province of Quebec. He said also if he got the money he would go to the United States and start a paper and raise the other nationalities in the States. He said: "Before the grass is that high in this country, you will see foreign armies in this country." He said: "I will commence by destroying Manitoba, and then I will come and destroy the North-West and take possession of the North-West." *He told the witness that he considered himself a prophet; one evening there was a noise in Riel's bowels, and Riel told him that it was his liver, and that he had inspirations which worked through every part of his body. He wrote his inspirations on a sheet of paper, and said he was inspired.* Whenever the word "police" was pronounced he became very excited. He proposed a plan to the witness, and said he had decided to take up arms, and the first thing was to fight for the glory of God, for the honour of religion, and for the salvation of souls. Before the Duck Lake fight he was going about with a crucifix a foot and a half long, taken out of the church. Now all these things save the last were before the rebellion, and a great portion of them in the year before the rebellion, the year 1884.

THEN, P. GARNOT PROVES

that about the beginning of the outbreak, Riel talked to him about changing the Pope; wanting to name Bishop Bourget Pope of the new world. *He said that the spirit of Elias was with him;* he wanted the people to acknowledge him as a prophet, and said he had the spirit of Elias in him and was

prophesying. *Another time he declared he was representing St. Peter.* Almost every morning he would come in front of the people and say such and such a thing would happen. *When he slept at the witness's house he was praying loud all night; THERE WAS NO ONE ELSE THERE.* He would not stand any contradiction by any one. He several times said how this country was to be divided into seven Provinces, one for the French, Germans, Irish, and others; he mentioned Italians; he expected the assistance of an army of several nationalities; he mentioned the Jews, he expected their assistance and money, and he was going to give them a Province as a reward for their help. He had no doubt of his success, or that any obstacle could prevent him from succeeding; he always mentioned that he was going to succeed, that he had a divine mission, and was an instrument in the hands of God. The witness thought the man was crazy, because he acted very foolish, and communicated to others at the time this impression of him.

SIMILAR EVIDENCE FROM OTHER WITNESSES.

George Ness says that at the beginning of the outbreak he witnessed a difficulty between Riel and Father Moulin, in which Riel accused Bishop Grandin and Bishop Taché of being thieves and rogues. Father Moulin wished to speak to the people, but Riel refused and said, "No, we won't let him speak; take him away, take him away, we will tie him." Riel said he would take possession of the church. Father Moulin said he protested. "Look at him," said Riel, "he is a Protestant." He said that the Spirit of God was in him. Father Moulin said he was making a schism in the church. Riel said Rome had fallen. "*Rome est tombée,*" and that the Pope was no longer legally Pope; that the Spirit of God was in him (Riel), and that he could tell future events.

Dr. Willoughby says: At the commencement he saw Riel. He said his proclamation was at Pembina, that it was going forth, and he would be joined by Indians and half-breeds, and that the United States was at his back. He intended to divide the country into seven portions; he mentioned as parties Bavarians, Poles, Italians, Germans and Irish. There was to be a New Ireland in the North-West. These nationalities were going to assist him in the rebellion, before the war was over, and they would have their portion. He mentioned the Irish of the

United States, the Germans, Italians, Bavarians and Poles. He put Germany and Ireland twice; first, the Irish and Germans of the United States, then Germany and Ireland themselves. The proposition did not appear rational to the witness, who also proves the excitement of Riel.

Saunderson says: Riel told him that he was going to divide the country into sevenths, one-seventh for Canadians or white settlers, one for the Indians, one for the half-breeds, three-sevenths to remain to support the Government. He said he had cut himself loose from Rome altogether, and would have nothing more to do with the Pope.

Walters says: Riel told him that the land was to be divided—one-seventh to the pioneer whites, one-seventh to the French-half-breeds, one-seventh to the church and schools, and the balance was to be Government lands. He said that if the whites struck a blow a thunderbolt from heaven would strike them, that God was with their people.

Lash says: He mentioned that he was going to give one-seventh to the Indians and one-seventh to the half-breeds. He had been waiting fifteen years and at last his opportunity had come. Astley proposed an exchange of prisoners, but Riel came up and said he could not see it in that light, but that he would exchange them for Hon. L. Clarke, Registrar Sproat and McKay. We know what an exchange of prisoners is, but Riel proposed that the most important personages on the other side should be given up to him in lieu of inferior prisoners on the same side whom he had in his hands.

Jackson says Riel told him his brother's mind was affected; that it was a judgment on him for opposing Riel. He talked of giving one-seventh of the proceeds of the land to the Poles, one-seventh to the half-breeds and one-seventh to the Indians, and some to the Hungarians, and so on. I was surprised to hear it stated that it was a mark of sanity in Riel that he should have thought Jackson insane, while we know that inmates of the insane asylums know that their neighbours are insane and discuss the question of their insanity.

Mackay had a conversation with Riel. He appeared very excited and said:

"It was blood, and the first blood they wanted was mine. There were some little dishes on the table, and he got hold of a spoon and said: You have no blood—you are a traitor to your people. Your blood is frozen, and all the little blood you have will be there in five minutes, putting the spoon up to my face and pointing to it. I said: If you

think you are benefiting your cause by taking my blood you are quite welcome to it. He called his people and the committee, and wanted to put me on trial for my life, and Garnot got up and went to the table with a sheet of paper, and Gabriel Dumont took a chair on a syrup keg, and Riel called up the witnesses against me. He said I was a liar, and he told them that I had said all the people in that section of the country had risen against them. He said it was not so, that it was only the people in this town. He said he could prove that I was a liar by Thomas Scott."

Then goes on the account of the trial during which Riel was up stairs.

"When he came down he, Riel, apologized to me for what he had said, that he did not mean it to me personally, that he had the greatest respect for me personally, but that it was my cause he was speaking against and he wished to show he entertained great respect for me. He also apologized in French to the people there, and he said as I was going out he was very sorry I was against him; that he would be glad to have me with them, and it was not too late for me to join them yet."

Young says:

"Riel explained that at Duck Lake he gave three commands to fire.

"1. In the name of God who made us, reply to that.

"2. Then they fired and Crozier's men replied; and Riel said: In the name of God the Son who saved us, reply to that.

"3. In the name of God the Holy Ghost who sanctifies us, reply to that."

Riel gives a like account in less detail to half a dozen witnesses of his action at that time, and General Middleton says:

"Of course I had heard constantly before about reports of his insanity. I heard for instance one or two of the people that escaped from him, scouts, half-breeds. One man, I remember, told me, 'Oh! Riel is mad, he is a fool.' He told me what he was doing at Batoche. So that I really had heard it, but I came to the conclusion that he was very far from being mad or a fool."

RIEL'S CONDUCT AT THE TRIAL.

To that is to be added the prisoner's own conduct at the trial, the statements he made, even in the course of his interruptions during the trial, with reference to these points, and then in his addresses. In them you will find him declare that he does not plead insanity, and you find him saying he showed that calmness which they said he could not show. He obviously in the address he made to the jury was doing his best to restrain himself in respect to those matters which had been presented as proofs of his insanity, with the view and in the hope, so far as was consistent with his assumed position, that he might prevent the jury from coming to the conclusion that he was insane. For instance, this ex-

traordinary division of the territory into sevenths among different nationalities was pressed very much. What does he say to that? He says:

"A good deal has been said about the settlement and division of lands; a good deal had been said about that. I do not think my dignity today here would allow me to mention the foreign policy; but if I was to explain to you, or if I had been allowed to make the questions to witnesses, those questions would have appeared in an altogether different light"

A little after, when the verdict had been given and he was showing his reasons against the sentence, you will find he developed the policy which at this time he preferred not to do when he restrained himself, as those people often do under similar circumstances, in order to obtain that which he desired, a verdict which would not find him insane. He speaks in the same way, thanking General Middleton and Captain Young for proving him as he believes he is sane.

RIEL ON HIS OWN INSPIRATION.

Having touched the question of foreign policy, as he calls it, in the lands, he feels called upon to deal with this question of inspiration, and he attempts to explain that matter. He says:

"It is not to be supposed that the half-breeds acknowledge me as a prophet if they had not seen that I could see something into the future. *If I am blessed without measure I can see something into the future; we all see into the future more or less. Last night while I was taking exercise the spirit who guides and assists me and consoles me told me that to-morrow somebody will come 'l'aider' and help me.* I am consoled by that. While I was recurring to my God, to our God, I said: But woe to me if you not help me, and those words came to me in the morning: 'In the morning some one will come *t'aider*, that is to-day.' I said that to my two guards, and you can go for the two guards. I told them that if the spirit that directs me is the spirit of truth it is to-day that I expect help. This morning the good doctor who has care of me came to me and said: 'You will speak to-day before the court.' I thought I would not be allowed to speak; those words were given to me to tell me that I would have the liberty to speak. There was one French word in it; it meant, I believe, that there was to be some French influence in it, but the most part English. It is true that my good lawyers from the Province of Quebec have given me good advice. Mr. Nolan came into the box and said that Mr. Riel said that he heard a noise in his bowels and that I told him that it meant something. I wish that he had said what I said what I wrote on the paper of which he speaks; perhaps he can yet be put in the box. I said to Nolan 'Do you hear?' Yes, I said there will be trouble in the North-West; and was it so or not, has there been no trouble in the North-West? If it is any satisfaction to the doctors to know what kind of insanity I have, *if they are going to call my pretensions insanity, I say humbly, through the grace of God I believe I am the*

prophet of the new world. I wish you to believe that I am not trying to play insanity; there is in the manner, in the standing of a man, the proof that he is sincere, not playing."

THANKFUL TO BE FOUND GUILTY AND SANE.

Then, the moment the verdict was given and the prisoner was called to speak in respect of sentence, he congratulates himself and thanks the jury for having found him sane, and says: "At least if I were going to be executed I would not be executed as an insane man." Then he goes on to say:

"In some way I think that to a certain number of people the verdict against me to-day is a proof that may be I am a prophet, may be Riel is a prophet. He suffers for it. Now, I have been hunted as an elk for fifteen years. David has been seventeen, I think. I would have to be about two years still; if the misfortunes that I have had to go through were to be as long as those of the old David I would have two years still, but I hope it will come sooner."

Then he proceeds to describe what he had kept concealed in the earlier speech—the question of the lands. He says:

"The half-breeds had a million and the land grant of 1,400,000 acres out of about 9,500,000, if I mistake not, which is about one-seventh of the land of Manitoba. You will see the origin of my insanity and of my foreign policy. One-seventh of the land was granted to the people, to the half-breeds of Manitoba, English and French, Protestant and Catholic. There was no distinction whatever, but in the subdivision, in the allotment of those lands between the half-breeds of Manitoba, it came that they had 240 acres of land. Now, the Canadian Government say that we will give to the half-breeds of the North-West 240 acres. If I was insane I would say yes, but as I have had, thank God, all the time the conscientiousness that I had a certain degree of reason, I have made up my mind to make use of it, and to say that one-seventh of the lands of Manitoba, as the inauguration of a principle in the North-West, had to bring to the half-breeds of the North-West, at least as soon as possible, the guarantee for the future that a seventh part of the lands will also be given to them. And seeing and yourself understanding how it is difficult for a small population as the half-breed population to have their voice heard, I said what belongs to us ought to be ours. Our right to the North-West is acknowledged, our co-partnership with the Indians acknowledged, since one-seventh of the lands is given us, but we have not the means to be heard, what we do? I said to some of my friends: If there is no other way, we will make the people who have no country understand that we have a country here which we have ceded on condition. We want the seventh of the land, and if the bargain is not kept, it is null and void, and we have no right to retreat again, and if we cannot have our seventh of the lands from Canada we will ask the people of the States, the Italians to come and help us as immigrants. The Irish I will count them.

"Now, it is my turn, I thank you. I count them and I will show you if I made an insane enumeration of the parties. I say we will invite the Italians of the States, the Irish of the States, the Bavarians of the States, Poles of the States, Belgians of the States, and if they come and help us here to have the seventh, we will give them each a seventh; and to show that we are not fanatics, that we are not partisans, that we do not wish only for the Catholics, but that we have a consideration for those who are not Catholics, I said we will invite the

Danes. We will invite the Swedes, who are numerous in the States, and the Norwegians, to come around, and as there are Indians and half-breeds in British Columbia; and as British Columbia is a part of the immense North-West, we said, not only for ourselves, but speaking for our children, we will make the proposition that if they help us to have our seventh on the two sides of the Rocky Mountains, they will each have a seventh; and if the Jews will help us, and on the condition that they acknowledge Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the only Saviour of human kind, if they help us with their money, we will give them one-seventh. And I said, also, if the principle of giving one-seventh of the lands is good in the North-West, if the principle of giving one-seventh of the lands to the half-breeds in the North-West is good, it ought to be good in the east also; and I said, if it is not possible that our views should be heard, we will—I, as an American citizen—I will invite the Germans of the United States, and I will say: If you ever have an opportunity of crossing the line in the east, do it, and help the Indians and the half-breeds of the east to have a revenue equivalent to about one-seventh. And what would be the reward of the Germans? The reward of the Germans would be, if they were successful, to take a part of the country, and make a new German-Indian world somewhere in British North America. But that is the last resort, and if I had not had a verdict of guilt against me I would have never said it. Yesterday it was just those things that I have avoided to say, when I said, I have a reason not to mention them. And when I said, as one of the witnesses said, that my proclamation was in Pembina, I think I am right, because of this trial. You see that my pretension is that I can speak a little of the future events. My trial has brought out the question of the seventh, and although no one has explained the things as I do now, still there is enough said about the sevenths of the lands and the divisions of the lands into sevenths, seven nationalities, while it ought to have been said ten nationalities, that by telegraph to-day my proclamation is in Pembina truly, and the States have my ideas."

Then he reverts to it again, and says:

"My heart will never abandon the idea of having a new Ireland in the North-West, by constitutional means, inviting the Irish of the other side of the sea to come and have a share here; a new Poland in the North-West, by the same way; a new Bavaria by the same way; a new Italy in the same way. And on the other side of the mountains there are Indians, as I have said, and half-breeds, and there is a beautiful island, Vancouver, and I think the Belgians will be happy there, and the Jews, who are looking for a country for 1,800 years, the knowledge of which the nations have not been able to attain yet, while they are rich and the lords of finance. Perhaps will they hear my voice one day, and on the other side of the mountains, while the wave of the Pacific will chant sweet music for them, to console their hearts for the mourning of 1,800 years. Perhaps will they say: He is the one thought of us in the whole Cree world, and if they help us there on the other side between the great Pacific and the great Rockies to have a share, the Jews from the States."

Then he says:

"The Scandinavians, if possible, they will have a share. It is my plan, it is one of the illusions of my insanity, if I am insane, that they should have on the other side of the mountain a new Norway, a new Denmark and a new Sweden, so that those who spoke of the lands of the great North-West to be divided in seven forget that it was in ten, the French in Manitoba, the Bavarians, the Italians, the Poles, and the Irish in the North-West, and then five on the other side too."

Then again he says:

"Not insanity, because it is disposed of, but whether I am a deceiver or an impostor. I have said to my lawyers: 'I have written things which were said to me last night, and which have taken place to-day. I said that before the court opened last night the spirit that guides and assists me told me: 'The court will make an effort.'"

Now these were the events of the trial itself, and apart altogether from the other evidence which is before us, although not official. There was, besides

THE EVIDENCE OF THE OTHER MEDICAL WITNESSES.

Dr. Clark was called and examined. He had examined Riel three times, had heard the evidence, and if he was not feigning he was insane to the limit of irresponsibility. But it takes long to find out that a man is insane. Dr. Wallace, who, I believe, is the Superintendent of the Hamilton Lunatic Asylum, examined him once and heard the evidence. He could only say that he did not find out—he might be insane. It takes long to find out whether a man is insane. Dr. Jukes, who was not a specialist, and was the police surgeon in charge of the prisoner, had never examined or tested him at all. He also says it takes a long time to find out though he had not found out anything to show his insanity. *Now I do not myself believe that it can be at all seriously contended that this man was feigning. The old insanity had recurred. They were the same sort of views which he had expressed during the old insanity. He was most anxious to avoid the imputation of insanity, and to this end he restrained himself at the trial, to a considerable extent in his expressions. He was artful in his insanity, as often happens, and what he wanted was to show that he was a genuine prophet. All the symptoms which are stated in cases of feigned insanity are symptoms which indicate that*

THIS MAN'S INSANITY WAS NOT FEIGNED.

Taylor says:

"It is necessary to remember that insanity is never assumed until after the commission of a crime and the actual detention of a criminal. No one feigns insanity merely to avoid suspicion."

The same learned author says:

"I am indebted to a learned judge for the following note on feigned insanity: 'It may be safely held that a person feigning insanity will rarely if ever try to prove himself to be sane—for he runs the great risk of satisfying others that he is sane—the conclusion he desires to avoid. There is no better proof in general that the insanity (supposing other evidence of it to be strong) is real than in the keen and eager attempt by the

accused to prove that he is sane, and strong and indignant remonstrance against being held to be insane, though that would protect himself against trial and punishment."

Now, Sir, my clear conclusion from this evidence is that in the testimony at the trial there was overwhelming proof of great disorder of intellect, of insane delusions on religious and political topics, those very topics out of which the acts grew. Now it is unnecessary to enquire for the purpose of the issue before us whether that disorder was so great as, by our law,

TO JUSTIFY A VERDICT OF NOT GUILTY,

on the ground of insanity. On that point minds will differ as to whether it was great enough or not. Assume if you please—and I think there is great force in the proposition—that, dealing with the verdict of the jury and with the judgment of the court in Manitoba, you may not unfairly argue that it was indicated strongly so far as the evidence at the trial went that he was not so irresponsible within the meaning of the law as to have a verdict of not guilty returned—though that conclusion would not accord with my own individual opinion. But assume that. Give the verdict all its just weight; omit the very strong point to which my hon. friend from East Quebec alluded, the evidence in the case of Jackson which I have read in the imperfect report we got in the newspapers, in which Dr. Jukes seems to have sworn that with the exception of something said about his not speaking rationally all the while, his delusions were much the same as Riel's and on which evidence he was found insane; I say that *assuming, if you please, that the disorder was not so serious as to render the prisoner wholly irresponsible, so deciding you justify the verdict of guilty, and having justified the verdict of guilty, you by no means rid the Executive of very grave duties.*

JUDICIAL DUTIES OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Now upon this question there are very serious errors largely prevailing in the public mind. It is common talk, and this House has not been wholly free from that common talk, that there should be no interference with the verdict or sentence in capital cases; talk which, if it were acted on, would render it impossible to maintain capital punishment on the Statute Book for twelve months in any civilized country. Now I shall prove the errors of this view by statistics. The statistics of the administration of justice in

England and Wales during ten years before 1863 show that the proportion of convictions to committals, for all classes of crimes taken together, was 70 to 71 per cent.; and I may say that there is a curious run of similarity for many years in both England and Canada in that regard. But for murder during those ten years the proportion of convictions to committals was only 23½ per cent., or a little over one-third of the proportion in the general run. *While thus you find, in the first place, that a much smaller proportion of persons in proportion to those charged were convicted of murder than in the general run, you find the proportion of executions to the convictions for murder was but 60 per cent., and that 40 per cent. were commuted.* In the twenty years from 1861 to 1880 there were 512 capital sentences for murder. Out of those there were only 279 executions, or 54½ per cent., and 233 not executed, or 45½ per cent. In the five years from 1880 to 1884 there were 168 capital sentences. Out of these only 80 executions took place, or 48 per cent.; 88 were not executed, or 52 per cent. Thus there are now fewer executions in proportion to sentences than there were. In the first period I gave you there were something more than half; during the second period there were fewer, but still a little more than half; but for the last available period *less than half those sentenced were executed.* In France, by the evidence taken in 1864, the persons found guilty of murder in four years, from 1859 to 1862, were 1,368; of these 1,223, or nine-tenths, were found guilty, with extenuating circumstances, leaving only 140 or one-tenth guilty and liable to death. These were the very worst cases, yet of these about one-half only were executed and the rest were commuted.

Now take Ontario and Quebec, in the four years 1880 to 1883. According to the criminal statistics brought down by the hon. gentleman opposite there were ninety-six persons charged with murder: twenty-six only were convicted, or 25 per cent.; thirteen only were left for execution; every second sentence was commuted. During the same four years 70 per cent. of those charged with all crimes were convicted; and the commutations (including murder and second commutations of capital cases) were only one in 350, and of those many were due to ill-health. The result is that of 500 charged with all crimes 350 are convicted, and of these 349 or more suffer the sentence of the law, so that practically the sentence is executed in all these cases. But of 500 charged with

murder only 135 are convicted instead of 350, the general average; of the 135 only sixty-seven or sixty-eight suffer the sentence of the law, or one out of two, instead of 349 out of 350, the general average. Of the 500 charged with murder only sixty-seven are convicted and suffer the sentence of the law, or less than 12 per cent. of the committals; while out of 500 charged with all crimes 349 or more are convicted and suffer the sentence of the law, or 70 per cent of the committals—nearly six times as many as in capital cases.

WHAT IS THE GENERAL RESULT?

The general result of these statistics is that in England, in France, in Ontario and Quebec, there is a more careful sifting in the preliminary process before verdict in the capital cases than there is in the general average of crime. There is a greater reluctance to convict, there is a greater tendency to acquit, and so there is a very much smaller proportion of persons charged with that particular offence, the capital offence, who are convicted than of those who are charged with other offences. What follows? It is that it is in the *residuum*, the worst cases, the plainest cases, the most obvious cases alone that conviction takes place, and after that preliminary sifting which results in the most obvious and plainest cases only leading to conviction in cases of charges of murder; yet while only one in 350 of all classes of sentences is commuted, in capital cases 175 out of 350 are commuted. Why is it that we do not interfere with other sentences, and yet we interfere to such an enormous extent with these particular sentences, capital sentences?

REASON FOR THE LARGE PROPORTION OF COMMUTATIONS TO DEATH SENTENCE.

The reason is perfectly obvious. It is because there are various classes and degrees of moral guilt in the same legal definition, and because in all other cases than cases of capital sentence the judge has a discretion to apportion the punishment to the particular circumstances of the case. He does so. He tempers justice with mercy himself; he considers the palliating circumstances; he considers among other things the state of mind and degree of responsibility; he exercises a wide discretion; he may have a right to commit a man for life or for one hour; for a long term of years or for a month. The law gives it to him because the law feels that in all these classes of cases, of larceny, of intent to commit murder, of assault, of what crime you will it is impossible to predicate

the same degree of moral guilt, and therefore that it is essential to provide some machinery by which, to some extent, the punishment awarded shall be proportionate to the degree of guilt in the specific case. *But in capital cases there are not less—there are even more—shades of guilt than there are in other cases.* No one will dispute that; no one who has read the interesting but harrowing accounts of murder trials but must agree that there are all sorts and shades of guilt in the commission of that which, according to the law of the land, is yet always murder. *And yet in that particular case the judge has not any discretion at all.* He must pronounce the only sentence, the ultimate sentence, the maximum sentence, the sentence which is the worst and severest sentence now applied, not to all murderers, but to the worst murderers alone. But there is a discretion, notwithstanding. There is no reason why, in this particular case, there should not be somewhere that discretion which exists in other cases, not as a part of the prerogative of mercy, but as part of the administration of criminal justice, which in other cases is vested in the judge. *It is impossible to say that you should not find somewhere in the case of murder the discretion to apportion the punishment to the moral guilt, when you give it by your Statute Books in all the other cases in the land.* For reasons which I need not discuss, this discretion is not in capital cases vested in the judge. The reasons may be satisfactory or unsatisfactory; it is no matter, but in fact the discretion rests in capital cases not with the judge, but with the Executive, and IN THIS CASE THE MINISTERS DISCHARGE UNDER THE LAW OF THE LAND A DUTY WHICH IS PART OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, AND WHICH IN ALL OTHER CASES IS, UNDER THE LAW OF THE LAND, DISCHARGED BY THE JUDGE WHO TRIES THE CASE AND AWARDS THE SENTENCE. They have combined and commingled also the prerogative of mercy strictly so called, as distinguished from this part of the administration of justice, the prerogative which they exercise with reference to all cases. If they think the judge's sentence too severe, they may—though I am glad to say the power is rarely exercised—commute the severe sentence of the judge. This is a distinct exercise of the prerogative of mercy, and in the capital cases they have, as a matter of course, to consider the two positions, and they are commonly considered together; the whole case and the circumstances are considered together. Now I think I have shown you

perfectly plainly and perfectly clearly that there is the most marked distinction that can be conceived between the capital sentence and its execution and all other sentences and their execution. I might put it to you in another point of view in this way: The case would be the same in kind, though not in degree, if your law for all other crimes than the capital crimes obliged the judge to award the maximum sentence which the law now awards for the particular crime. Then you would immediately have the Executive necessarily invaded with applications, as a branch of the administration of criminal justice. They would say: Your law has made no distinction at all, yet the moral guilt and the degree of responsibility varies, and in this case it is very light, and yet there is a twenty years' sentence; you must mitigate. This discretion the judge exercises now in all other cases. You accomplish this result by another operation in cases of capital sentence. You do it by the operation of the Executive in the case of a capital sentence. Thus the capital sentence is not in the sense which has been applied to it, the sentence of the law with reference to the capital crime. It is the extreme sentence of the law. It is not the rule to execute that sentence. In Ontario and Quebec as many sentences are commuted as are executed, and in England and Wales more. There it is the exception to execute, and why? Because it is not fitting there any more than in other cases to apply as a rule the extreme, the maximum penalty of the law to this class of crimes. Now, Sir, I have spoken up to this point of the capital offence of murder, because it is in practice—or was in practice until the 16th of November, in modern times—the only capital offence.

THE OLD LAW AS TO HIGH TREASON,

of course, remains, but milder views have long prevailed with reference to political offences. Since June, 1848, in England, and since a later period here, the same offences precisely, the same character of offences may be, and since that time as far as I know have always been in England tried under the milder Act as treason-felony in respect of which the maximum sentence is imprisonment for life. I do not mean that this observation applies to isolated acts of murder, which are generally excluded from amnesties and are tried as such. If, therefore, there be any distinction with reference to the application of the general principles of the administration of criminal justice to which I have adverted and which I have

established, if there be any distinction between murder and treason, it is not what has been intimated from the other side. It is not that your law is more severe in the case of treason; it is that your law is milder in the case of treason. It is that while you continue in the case of murder to provide only a machinery under which the sentence must be capital, yet you have provided in the case of treason, and you have used in every case in the North-West except one, a milder procedure, another law in respect to which the maximum penalty is imprisonment for life for the same offence. There is the distinction as it is enshrined in the Statute Book in England and Canada, and *you cannot from that make out this conclusion which hon. gentlemen opposite have made of treason as the highest crime.* I know there is a sense in which it may be so regarded. You may talk about the life of the State, the body politic, the corporation, and so on; but I think I shall show before I sit down how much there is in all that. The distinction, then, is that. Now, Sir, I ask what more is to be said after this statement, of its being a duty on the part of the Executive to carry out the sentence of the law? I maintain that there is

NO DUTY ON THE PART OF THE EXECUTIVE,

to leave the law to take its course when in this particular case, it is the maximum punishment which the law obliges the judge to award, and when, as I have shown, as often as not that maximum punishment is not inflicted. *In truth and in fact, disguise it how you will, in England, in France, in Canada, it is the Executive that awards the real sentence of the law in capital cases; and in this particular case the duty of the Executive was emphasized and enlarged by the special provision in North-West Territories Act, which having a due regard, or some regard, to the comparative weakness of the tribunal and the circumstances of the case, made a special provision under which the sentence was not to be executed until the pleasure of the Executive was known; which the learned Chief Justice of Manitoba described as providing in fact three trials: First, before the judge and jury; secondly, before the court in Manitoba; and thirdly, before the court in Ottawa—the Executive of the country.*

THE PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.

Now Sir, I propose to reinforce the position which I have taken as flowing inevitably

from the statistics and the reasoning which I have given you, as to the principles and the practice of the exercise of what is called the prerogative of mercy. And first of all let me deal with it in capital cases generally. I quote from the same learned authority to which I before referred, Sir James Stephen's work :

"The subject of the discretion exercised by the judges in common cases, and by the Executive Government (practically the Home Secretary) in capital cases, appears to me to be little understood. As to this it must be remembered that it is practically impossible to lay down an inflexible rule by which the same punishment must in every case be inflicted in respect of every crime falling within a given definition, because the degrees of moral guilt and public danger involved in offences which bear the same name and fall under the same definition must of necessity vary. There must therefore be a discretion in all cases as to the punishment to be inflicted. This discretion must from the nature of the case be vested either in the judge who tries the case, or in the Executive Government, or in the two acting together.

"From the earliest period of our history to the present day the discretion in misdemeanor at common law has been vested in the judge. . . . The cases which still continue to be capital—practically murder and treason—supply the only instances worth noticing in which the judge has no discretion. *The discretion in such cases is vested in the Secretary of State.*

"It was never intended that capital punishment should be inflicted whenever sentence of death was passed. Even when the criminal law was most severe the power of pardon was always regarded as supplementary to it, and as supplying the power of mitigating sentences of death which the words of the law refused.

"The power of pardon, in the exercise of which Her Majesty, advised by the Home Secretary, still remains unaltered, and in respect of capital sentences, it answers the purposes fulfilled in other cases by the discretionary power entrusted to the judges. The fact that the punishment of death is not inflicted in every case in which sentence of death is inflicted proves nothing more than that murder, as well as other crimes, has its degrees, and that the extreme punishment which the law awards ought not to be carried out in all cases."

[NOTE. Here Mr. Blake made numerous citations, omitted for the sake of brevity.]

IN POLITICAL OFFENCES.

Then if you deal with cases of political offence, as has already been pointed out, the severity of the law has been mitigated in France by the Constitution of 1848, which abolished the punishment of death *en matière politique*. Now, let me come to the mode and extent of the exercise of this prerogative in these cases. In 1835, with regard to the Dorchester laborers, Lord Russell, then Home Secretary, said :

"What I have to say is that in this case, as in any other that may be brought before me, whether

in the House or out of it, I do not hold myself precluded from entering upon the consideration of any facts or circumstances that may come to my knowledge, or from forming a judgment upon them without reserve."

Mr. Home Secretary Walpole said that a murder referred to was one of aggravated enormity and barbarity ; yet the sentence was commuted. Again Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Home Secretary, said :

"After the trial and condemnation facts might come out which it would be desirable to sift ; and, however long it might be after a man's conviction, if circumstances transpired showing that the conviction was unjust, or throwing such a doubt on it as to make it clear that there ought to be some interference, there must necessarily be some authority to exercise the prerogative of mercy."

Then on the remission of capital punishment Mr. Bruce said :

"It is well that the House and country should understand how in the cases, which so often offend the honest opinion of the public, there is apparent discrepancy between the opinion of judge and jury on the one hand and that of the Home Secretary on the other. It arises from this—that the jury is obliged to find from the direction of the judge a verdict of wilful murder, and that the judge is constantly required to pass a sentence of death, when it is quite certain it will not, cannot, ought not, to be executed. . . . Such is the state of the law, and so long as it is the state of the law it is absolutely impossible but that the decision of the Secretary of State must occasionally be in disaccord with the finding of the jury and the sentence of the judge."

WHAT SHOULD BE THE EFFECT OF A RECOMMENDATION TO MERCY?

I think I have sufficiently established the accuracy of my statement, and enlarged even my own statement by these proofs of the extensive powers and consequential duties of the Executive in exercising this branch of the administration of criminal justice, particularly in capital cases ; but before I pass to the question of what should be done in cases of insanity and the specialties of those cases, I wish to make an allusion, at this point, to the effect of the recommendation to mercy. Sir J. Stephen says :

"It is true that the recommendation to mercy of an English jury has no legal effect and is no part of their verdict, but it is invariably considered with attention and is generally effective.

"In cases where the judge has a discretion as to sentence, he always makes it lighter when the jury recommend the prisoner to mercy. In capital cases, where he has no discretion, he invariably in practice informs the Home Secretary at once of the recommendation, and it is frequently, perhaps generally, followed by a commutation of the sentence.

PROPER EXERCISE OF PREROGATIVE IN CASES OF
INSANITY.

I turn to the question, so far as it may be illustrated by authority, of the exercise of mercy in those cases in which the defence of insanity arises, and upon that subject no less a learned judge than Lord Cranworth was examined by the Capital Punishment Commission in 1865, and the Attorney-General for Ireland put to him this statement:

"I happen to know a recent case where a man was tried, and the defence was insanity—incapacity to judge of his actions. The jury convicted this man; not believing that he was insane. The Executive subsequently received information from various doctors who had not been produced, showing that the man really was insane, and in that case the prerogative of mercy was exercised, the man being retained in prison."

And the answer was:

"That would be the reasonable mode of dealing with him."

So you see that where the question of insanity was raised at the trial, and where the jury decided against it, and where the Executive upon the evidence given at the trial and before them did not think they were wrong—and where of course the judge was not dissatisfied with the verdict either—yet where subsequent medical testimony was brought forward it was acted upon by the Executive and they commuted upon the score of the subsequent medical testimony, and therefore they received it.

[Here further citations were made.]

You find the responsibility of the Government declared by the Lord Chancellor, the head of the judiciary and the legal official of the Government, who explains what is done in criminal cases where a man has been convicted and sentenced, and a question exists as to the state of his mind. You find that an inquiry is made, that medical opinions are taken, and evidence is taken as to the facts from which conclusions are to be drawn. Then the Royal Commission on Indictable Offences in 1878, composed as I said before of Judges Blackburn, Barry, Lush and Stephen, said:

"It must be borne in mind, that, although insanity is a defence which is applicable to any criminal charge, it is most frequently put forward in trials for murder, and for this offence the law—and we think wisely—awards upon conviction a fixed punishment which the judge has no power to mitigate. In the case of any other offence, if it should appear that the offender was afflicted with some unsoundness of mind, but not to such a degree as to render him irresponsible—in other words where the criminal element predominates, though mixed in a greater or less degree with the insane element—the judge can apportion the punish-

ment to the degree of criminality, making allowance for the weakened or disordered intellect. But in a case of murder this can only be done by an appeal to the Executive; and we are of opinion that this difficulty cannot be successfully avoided by any definition of insanity which would be both safe and practicable, and that many cases must occur which cannot be satisfactorily dealt with otherwise than by such an appeal."

Now this is stated at a late day by men of the highest authority, having had the advantage of the evidence of many learned men engaged in the actual administration of the criminal law, declaring the theory and practice of that administration in cases in which there is a weak or disordered intellect, though not so weak or disordered as to justify a verdict of not guilty on the ground of insanity; and in language in which I would only weaken by attempting to restate the argument, they point out

WHAT COMMON SENSE AND COMMON HUMANITY
APPROVE,

that a weak and disordered intellect, although there may be enough to leave a man responsible, leaves him not responsible to the same degree as to the severity of punishment, as if he were of perfectly sound mind; and that while in all other cases by the law the precise sentence proper to be awarded as proportioned to the moral guilt and to the palliative circumstances, is fixed by the judge, in the particular case in which the sentence is that of death, that duty is discharged by the Executive. Sir James Stephen in his book to which I have so frequently referred, alluding to the provision for recording sentences which had the effect of a reprieve, says:

"I remember a case in which Mr. Justice Wightman ordered sentence of death to be recorded upon a conviction for murder. *The prisoner, though not quite mad enough to be acquitted, was obviously too mad to be hanged.* I have met with cases in which I wished I had a similar power."

Mr. Stephen in the same book says:

"These conditions appear to me to show that murder, however accurately defined, must always admit of degrees of guilt, and it seems to me to follow that some discretion in regard to punishment ought to be provided in this and in nearly every other case. This discretion does in fact exist at present and is exercised by the Home Secretary, though on every conviction of murder sentence of death is passed by the judge."

Then he gives causes affecting the guilt of such an offence:

"There are many cases in which a man's mind is more or less affected by disease, but in which it cannot be said that he is entitled to be altogether acquitted on the ground of insanity."

[Here further citations were made.]

SUMMARY OF WHAT HAS NOW BEEN PROVED.

I think it is established beyond all contradiction that the practice accords with reason, that a disordered condition of the intellect, which in the view rightly or wrongly of the law is not sufficiently disordered to entitle the prisoner to immunity from crime, is yet regarded in dealing with the quantity of punishment awarded; that in all other cases than the capital cases that regard is paid by the judge; and in the capital cases it is to be paid by the Executive, whose duty is, not as a matter of clemency or mercy simply, but as part of the administration of criminal justice, as part of that justice which we declare in our Statute Books we seek to accomplish by the apportionment of the punishment to the moral guilt; to have regard to what surely must be an element of the moral guilt, the degree of the disordered intellect, the degree of the insane impulses, of the insane delusions of the unbalanced mind. Even although this degree may be not enough to entitle him to acquittal, though the verdict may be right and the judge's sentence under the law may be right, there is not a mere discretion but a sacred, solemn and imperative duty to have regard to the circumstances disclosed on the trial, and all other circumstances which may be made known; and if upon the whole of the circumstances you find, as was said by Mr. Justice Stephen, that the man was not mad enough to be acquitted but too mad to be hanged, you cannot shelter yourself under the proposition that it was your duty to carry out the sentence of the law, and that the verdict of the jury had settled all that matter. *The verdict of the jury settled no more than this: the prisoner was not so completely insane as to be entitled to be absolutely acquitted on the ground of insanity. Consistently with that finding, his intellect might be seriously disordered.* He might be seriously disordered mentally, though not sufficiently disordered to give him immunity. Is not that question to be decided? Was that question settled by the verdict? No, it was left unsettled. It was to be settled by the Executive. Has it been settled? If not, they did not discharge their duty. If they settled it, and decided that it did not apply in this case, then I humbly say that I wholly disagree from them in opinion. Now, Sir, to come to the other branch of this case,

THE QUESTION OF POLITICAL OFFENCES,

that has also to be considered on the question of the award of punishment, and in

this matter I am obliged to differ very much from the spirit of a good deal that has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. [Here further citations were made.] There is a most interesting and instructive discussion on Mr. O'Connor Power's motion, in 1877, with reference to certain Fenian convicts, notably, the Manchester murderers, of whom three suffered the extreme sentence of the law, and the others sentences of imprisonment for considerable terms; and after a period an agitation took place for a remission of these sentences. Mr. Gathorne Hardy said:

"He would admit that this question came very near the hearts of a great many of the Irish people; but they were not the whole people of the Empire. This was an empire and not an aggregate of separate kingdoms, and the Government had to consider the interests of the whole of this great empire. It was also a free empire. Every man who was wronged had the opportunity of bringing his wrong to light, and there was no man who suffered an injury who had not an opportunity of obtaining redress in a constitutional manner. Therefore the man who took up arms had to vindicate himself from a charge of the deepest dye. Where there was no necessity—not even an excuse—for shedding blood, the man who raised his arm to shed blood committed a crime; and for that crime the country had a right to demand, he would not say vengeance, but the utmost punishment the law allowed. Much more when men who had taken upon themselves the character of defenders of the country violated the oaths they had taken, and conspired to destroy the country, no punishment could be inflicted upon them which they did not deserve."

Then the Attorney-General of England in the same debate, describing the offences, used these words:

"Hon. members might, if they liked, call that accidental shooting, but he (Attorney-General) called it deliberate homicide. . . . They might call it a technical crime, but he called it vulgar murder. They might call it a political offence; he called it deliberate and atrocious assassination. It was a deliberately planned attack, carried out by the prisoners who were afterwards convicted, regardless whether they committed murder or not, but determined to do murder rather than fail in their object."

Mr. Pease, the member I think for South Durham, said:

"Well they had had a real rebellion some years ago in Ireland, headed by a gentleman who sat for many years in that House, and was highly respected by all who knew him—he alluded to Mr. Smith O'Brien. He was taken while in arms, holding a cottage some hours against the Queen's soldiers; and in that extreme case, when the offender was actually convicted of treason and formally sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered, the dread sentence was afterwards commuted to 14 years' banishment, and was afterwards again commuted, and Mr. Smith O'Brien was brought home to his country. Had any of them whose fate was now before the House of Commons been guilty of such a great crime as Mr. Smith O'Brien? He had signed the roll of Parliament, had taken the oath of allegiance, was in the Queen's Commission of the Peace, and yet it was felt consistent with public safety to commute his punishment twice after he had been sentenced to death, and had been transported to mark the turpitude of his crime."

Mr. Gladstone said :

"The question which we have to determine is, what constitutes a political offence. It is quite clear that an act does not become a political offence because there was a political motive in the mind of the offender. The man who shot Mr. Percival and the man who intended to shoot Sir Robert Peel did not become political offenders merely on this ground. By a political offence I at least understand an offence committed under circumstances approaching to the character of civil war. Whenever there is a great popular movement the offences committed in giving effect to the intentions of the people partake of the character of civil war. Reference has been made to the action of the President of the French Republic in pardoning offences committed by Communists; but it must not be forgotten that the offences—though darker than the crimes for which the Irish prisoners are under punishment—were committed in the progress of a civil war. But the riot committed at Manchester, by a crowd locally gathered together, was a proceeding totally of a different character, and must be considered as in the main belonging to the category of ordinary crime, though it is not on the ground that the offence is a political offence that I think the prisoners in question can be recommended for consideration. But if these offences be not political offences in a strict sense, yet they were undertaken for a political motive, and in so far partake of that character as to affect in a material degree the moral guilt of the persons concerned."

That was the observation made by the most eminent of Englishmen as to the ingredients of a political offence, even in a case so obviously gross and, as many of us would regard it, so totally alien from the ordinary category of political offences as the case of the Manchester murderers.

CANADIAN CASES.

Well, Sir, let us come to our own country. History repeats itself in a wonderful way. The signatories of the response in 1837 by the committee of the county of Montreal to the Workingmen's Association of London made this representation :

"Our grievances are not of new characters or of recent date. They have been publicly and distinctly stated, and the mode and measures of redress have been plainly defined. Our citizens have at public meetings reiterated them for years past. They have founded upon them humble petitions to your Parliament, which turning a deaf ear now adds aggression to contempt."

That was signed among others by Papineau, O'Callaghan, Nelson, Duchesnois and Cartier; and then comes also something which shows us how power generally acts under circumstances like these. We remember the events—so widely differing in many particulars—of the Lower Canadian revolt. But see how power treated it in the proclamation of Sir John Colborne on the 29th of November, 1837 :

"Whereas, in divers counties of the district of Montreal, disaffection with the Government of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria has unequivocally declared itself, and divers outrages upon the persons and properties of Her Majesty's loyal subjects have

been recently perpetrated therein; and whereas, prisoners arrested on charge of high treason have been rescued from the hands of justice, and the troops of Her Majesty, in the lawful discharge of their duty, while aiding the civil authorities have been assailed and fired on by the hands of an armed peasantry :

"And whereas, it is notorious that the present blind and fatal excitement in that district is to be attributed to the machinations of a few evil minded and designing men, who have imposed upon the credulity of an unsuspicious peasantry, and by plausible misrepresentations and wilful calumny, by practising upon their fears and inflaming their passions, by appealing to national distinctions and exciting political prejudices, which it has been the unabated endeavour of the British Government to extinguish, have at length succeeded in implicating a part of a peaceable and loyal population in the first excess of a reckless and hopeless revolt."

You would almost think I was repeating a speech we heard the other day. Then we find how power acted again in the proclamation of Lord Gosford :

"Whereas, L. J. Papineau is charged with the crime of high treason, and there is reason to believe he has fled from justice; and whereas, it is expedient and necessary for the due administration of justice and for the security of Her Majesty's Government in this Province, that so great an offence should not escape unpunished :

"I do hereby require and command all subjects to discover, take, and apprehend the said L. J. Papineau and carry him before a justice; and for the encouragement of all persons to be diligent, a reward of £1,000."

A similar proclamation was issued against Wolfred Nelson, E. B. O'Callaghan, J. T. Drolet, M. P., W. H. Scott, M. P., A. Girod, T. S. Brown, C. H. O. Côté, M. P., J. J. Girouard, M. P., E. E. Rodier, M. P., and Jean O. Cherrier, offering £500 reward, and against others at the lesser price of £400. Then the ordinance of Lord Durham, who assumed to banish Wolfred Nelson, R. S. M. Bouchette, B. Viger, S. Marchessault, H. A. Gauvin, T. Goddu, R. Desrivieres and L. H. Masson to Bermuda also provided :

"If any of them, or if L. J. Papineau, C. H. O. Côté, J. Gagnon, R. Nelson, E. B. O'Callaghan, E. E. Rodier, T. S. Brown, L. Duvernay, E. Cartier, G. E. Cartier, J. Ryan, jun., L. Perrault, P. P. Demaray, Jos. F. Davignon and Louis Gautier, against whom warrants for high treason have been issued, shall hereafter without permission come into the Province they shall be deemed guilty of high treason and suffer death.

"Nothing in any proclamation shall extend to the cases of certain named persons, or of any other person charged with the murder of Lieut. Weir, or with the murder of the late J. Chartrand, and they shall derive no advantage from such proclamations."

The case of these persons was raised in the English House, and Lord John Russell said :

"The Government has not neglected to let Sir J. Colborne know its opinion of the inexpediency of inflicting capital punishment on occasions of this nature."

Sir Robert Peel argued that an exception should be made in the case of the murderers of Lieut. Weir. As soon after as 1841, the

following resolution was passed in the House of Assembly by a vote of 39 to 9:

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of this committee that a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, as representing the Crown in this Province, praying for the exercise of the Royal prerogative for granting a free pardon, indemnity and oblivion of all crimes, offences and misdemeanors, connected with the late unhappy troubles in the late Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, to such of Her Majesty's misguided subjects, in so far as may be compatible with the safety of the Crown and the security of the Province, and of all attainders and outlawries during the period of four years."

In 1842 Mr. Lafontaine proposed to Sir Charles Bagot an amnesty, to which he agreed for all except Papineau. Mr. Lafontaine declined, and threatened to resign. The Government yielded, and a *nolle prosequi* was ordered as to Papineau, whereon he was able to return, as he did in 1845. It is unnecessary, Sir, for me to refer to the Upper Canadian rebellion in respect of which one might almost go through a similar history. I have gone so far, in order to show the language which is used in events of this description, while they are going on, as contrasted with the language used a few years afterwards as illustrating the view taken when passions have subsided and the mists of prejudice have disappeared. It is to that view that the Executive should look in their determination of cases of this description. It is not the view of the moment; it is the view of the future they should look to. Then I turn to another case of a more recent date—

THE CASE OF THE FENIAN INVASIONS OF CANADA.

These Fenian invasions harassed us for a number of years. On the 9th of March, 1866, Lord Monck reports to the Secretary for the Colonies:

"These reports, taken in connection with the open avowals at their public meetings held in the United States of leaders of a portion of the Fenian Society that it was their intention to attack this Province, had induced a feeling of great uneasiness and insecurity amongst the people. . . . It will be satisfactory to you to learn that the order calling out the force was issued by telegraph from headquarters and the different stations late in the afternoon of Wednesday, the 7th instant, and that by noon on Thursday, the 8th, answers had been received showing that at that time about 8,000 men were mustered and prepared to move on any points where they might be required."

Well, the advance did not come at that time. On the 4th June, 1866, Lord Monck says:

"The body of Fenian conspirators who crossed the frontier from Buffalo to Fort Erie on the morning of Friday, 1st June, proved to be between 800 and 900 men, and seem to have been well armed. . . . Immediately on receipt of intelligence of the invasion, Major General Napier pushed on by rail to Chippewa

a force consisting of artillery and regular troops, under Col. Peacocke, 16th Regiment. . . . They came upon the Fenians encamped in a bush and immediately attacked them, but were outnumbered and compelled to retire to Port Colborne. This occurred some time on Saturday, 2nd June. . . . We have sixty-five prisoners in our possession, who have been by my direction committed to the common gaol, at Toronto, to await trial."

On the 8th June, 1866, Lord Monck writes thus:

"Immediately after the first news of the invasion reached me the whole volunteer force of the Province was placed on active duty. . . . I am sure I do not exaggerate when I say that within twenty-four hours after the issue of the order 20,000 men were under arms, and that within forty-eight hours after the same time they, in combination with the regular troops, were disposed by the Lieutenant-General commanding in positions which rendered the Province secure from attack. With the assistance of the officers and men of the ships of war now in the St. Lawrence, a flotilla of steamers has been chartered by the Provincial Government and fitted up as temporary gunboats for service both on the river St. Lawrence and the lakes. . . . Parliament is to assemble this day, and it is intended at once to suspend the *Habeas Corpus* Act, and to extend to Lower Canada the Act at present in operation in Upper Canada (Consolidated Statutes Upper Canada, chap. 99), providing for the trial by military courts martial of the prisoners."

The report of the Privy Council, 2nd June, 1870, calls the Fenian invaders "brigands." The despatch of Lord Granville expressly calls them "a body of conspirators" and declares that "it is not often in the history of civilized nations that a country has suffered from an attack so gratuitous and unjustifiable." The report of the Privy Council on 1st July, 1870, speaks of the Fenians as "the miscreants concerned in these outrages." The report of the Privy Council, 28th July, 1871, states that:

"The Fenian organization has for nearly seven years been a source of irritation and expense to the people of Canada."

The memorandum of the Privy Council of 1871 declares that one of the principal objects of the organization created in November, 1863, has been the conquest of Canada against the people of which it is not pretended it has had any cause of complaint. The report of the Privy Council of November, 1871, says of the expeditions:

"These plundering and murdering expeditions were promptly repulsed, but not without the loss of valuable lives and great injury to the country."

So much with reference to the view that high political authorities took of the character of those expeditions. Listen also to the language of Judge J. Wilson in passing sentence on R. B. Lynch, found guilty without any recommendation to mercy:

"You and those who were with you profess to have come here to redress the grievances of many centuries,

and to right the wrongs of an oppressed people. You allege that the iron heel of the Saxon was placed on the neck of the Celt hundreds of years ago, and that your object was to free your land from that oppression. If you had reflected you would have seen that you had begun to do this by attempting to inflict on us the very injuries under which you contemplated your native land as suffering. Why should your iron heel be placed on our necks? In what way did we hurt you that you should endeavour to do this grievous harm? and why should our homes be made desolate, our young men slain, and our farms pillaged by you? Will any man of sense answer these plain questions? Was it anything less than murder, was there any possible excuse for you to come here in the dead of night to kill our people, to ravage our homes and to lay waste our farms and habitations, in order, as you say, to relieve the conditions of Ireland? What right had you, or who could have authorized any man to commit such a wrong as you perpetrated upon us? It is putting the matter in a very plain and clear light, just such a light as you must have perceived it in, if you had thought for a moment before going on with this mad and wicked enterprise. You stand there surrounded by the friends and relations of the men you slew on that occasion. You cannot be surprised that the law should be enforced, and that you should suffer its dread penalty, as I am very much afraid you will; for how could we permit the young, unreflecting men who were brought here by you and others like you, who placed confidence in you, who put faith in what you said; how, I say, could we in justice punish them if we allowed you, the greater criminal, to escape?"

And after that sentence and under those circumstances, that sentence was not executed. The prisoner's sentence was commuted, not even for life, but for twenty years' imprisonment, and as far as my knowledge goes he was pardoned not very long after the sentence was given. That was the case of a person who never had any pretension of being a Canadian citizen, who never had any pretence of having a grievance against Canada, and who cost us so much in time, money, anxiety and life. *That indicates that the modern doctrine, as applied by ourselves in this case, is a doctrine which practically excludes from almost any conceivable case of a political offence a capital sentence.*

THE HALF-BREED REBELLION.

Now I turn to this case in hand, and I say that some language has been used before and in the course of this debate which I, for my part, cannot approve of, language which seems to ignore as non-existent the right of resistance. I think here, and I have never disguised my opinion, that the half-breeds should not have risen, and that in that sense the rebellion was not justifiable; but the position which was taken by the Minister of Militia at Winnipeg, and the position he took the other evening, and the position which other hon. gentlemen have taken in this debate upon the general question, seems to me to be at variance with our understood constitutional rights in the larger

sense. Always there is legal, but only generally is there moral guilt in a rising; always legally, generally morally, is there guilt, but not always morally. I cannot approve of the spirit of those observations. **GOD FORBID THAT WE CANADIANS SHOULD FORGET FOR A MOMENT THAT THE CORNER STONE OF OUR LIBERTY IS THE SACRED RIGHT OF RESISTANCE.** Some, through their blind zeal, do forget this. They forget that the sacred right of resistance was exemplified in the events which preceded the great charter, and is enshrined in that instrument itself; they forget that the pious and immortal memory of William is the memory of an intruder who rose to the throne through the people's resistance to their king; they forget that *the Battle of the Boyne was the triumph of the insurgents over the monarchy*; they forget that *the glorious revolution was the consecration of the right to resist*, and that the present settlement of the British Crown is the visible embodiment of that right. Let me read you just two passages on that point to show that I am not extreme in these views. Amos says:

"But, as now, resisting tests were inconsistent with the revolution which was founded upon resistance, those of the Acts of Uniformity and Militia were abolished at that epoch; and the non-resisting test in the Corporation Act was expunged from our statute book at the accession of the House of Brunswick.

"Thus there is no longer any obligation of conscience binding one soul in secular chains to regard the royal dignity merely as a descendible property, instead of viewing it as a trust for millions, subject to a right of resistance when rendered indispensably necessary by the *salus populi*."

And take Brougham's Political Philosophy:

"The national resistance was not only in point of historical fact the cause of the revolutionary settlement; it was the main foundation of that settlement. The structure of the Government was made to rest upon the people's right of resistance as upon its corner stone, and it is of incalculable importance that this never should be lost sight of; but it is of equal importance that we should bear in mind how essential to the preservation of the constitution, thus established and secured, this principle of resistance is; how necessary both for the governors and the governed it ever must be to regard this recourse to that extremity as always possible—an extremity no doubt, and to be cautiously embraced as such, but still an extremity within the people's reach, a protection to which they can and will resort as often as their rulers make such a recourse necessary for self-defence."

I say I can not, as a Liberal, permit sentiments which appear to me to be

SENTIMENTS OF RETROGRESSION

to the ages of absolute government, sentiments which from time to time in the best eras of English liberty have been repudiated, to pass without saying what I feel of the sacred right of resistance; and I think it

came with a very ill grace from the hon. the Minister of Militia to throw taunts at this side of the House upon that subject and to accuse us in effect of having stimulated by our views feelings of this description when he ought to have remembered that the Minister of the Interior under whose reign this rebellion broke out was the very gentleman who, in 1849, signed the annexation manifesto declaring that it was the object and intent of the signatories to agitate, peacefully of course, for—and they set that up as their object—separation from England and annexation to the States. According to the high-flown views of loyalty which hon. gentlemen opposite utter that would have been a treasonable act. I do not say it was a treasonable act. I shall not inquire into its motives and shall not ask how it was that the high-flying Tories suddenly turned round and advocated annexation. I believe there was a great deal to be said against the action of dismissing those who signed that statement from the militia; but for a gentleman who had for his colleague a Minister of the Interior who signed that declaration, and set that great example to the half-breeds, to give us the high-toned notions which he expressed was, I thought, a little out of place. Now, having said this as to the abstract right of resistance, I think it is important that we should remember also that the more representative and popular is our form of Government, the rarer are the occasions upon which resistance is necessary or justifiable for the redress of grievances. And, if, as stated in our Canadian charter, in that Colonial Secretary's despatch upon which our rights were chiefly dependent for so many years, if the spirit of our charter is observed, and so long as the Government is administered according to the well understood wishes of the people, there will be no grievances to redress, and consequently there will be no cause for agitation, moderate or extreme, resistant or otherwise; and on the other hand, if the Government is not administered according to the views of the people this Parliament is the field of battle, and we members of Parliament and representatives of the people are the army, it is in this peaceful way that our contests are conducted and our grievances are redressed, and that government according to the well understood wishes of the people is eventually obtained.

WHEN RIGHT OF RESISTANCE MAY BE EXCUS-
ABLY EXERCISED.

We must remember as well that whatever the form of government may be, whether

you have a parliamentary form of government or not, there are two other conditions which are essential to the moral justification of the exercise of the right of resistance: first, that the grievances must be serious, must have been long endured, patiently represented, all peaceful means used and exhausted, so that there seems to be no hope of amendment by other means; and, secondly, that there may be some reasonable hope of success by this, the last resort, not indeed without loss to those engaged, but of important practical results. Now in the case before us, unfortunately, so far as the unhappy persons who rose are concerned, our constitution was lame and imperfect. There was no representation in Parliament for them, and therefore we had not that safety-valve, that opportunity, that means of averting difficulties which a representative government applied to every part of the general body of the people gives. My own opinion is that, if at an earlier date that representative government had been accorded, that the circumstance would have prevented this rising. My opinion is, that if there had been a representative from the North-West, knowing what Mr. McDowell knew, what Mr. Lawrence Clarke knew, what the other persons who have made representations, some of which are before us, knew, a representative here in Parliament, speaking on the floor of this House the sense of his people, telling us what their difficulties were, calling for the papers, showing the grounds of their grievances and pointing out their neglect by the Government, each Session pointing out to the Government and to the House their remissness and declaring the growing condition of discontent and difficulty, the Government would have been stimulated to action, and that which ought to have been done would have been done, if not as early as it ought to have been done, yet early enough to avoid the frightful results which have given rise to this debate. The absence of that guide and safety-valve of course at once increased the responsibility of an autocratic and paternal Government such as ours was in reference to the North-West; a paternal Government which refused this assistance; and it also operated more or less inasmuch as they had not provided for them the representative machinery to diminish the moral guilt of the people. But with regard to the other aspects and conditions to which I have referred, I have already said that while I condemn as in the highest degree censurable the conduct of the Government, I myself

have not been able to agree that this rising was justified, that the conditions remove, although they may and in my opinion do lighten the stain of moral guilt; and therefore the case had to be dealt with on the question of punishment, and by the Executive under their responsibility to us. UNHAPPILY IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE IN THIS CASE FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO JUDGE THIS QUESTION FAIRLY. They had precluded themselves from that position. They had made this their own issue. They had declared that to admit the existence of grievances as a justification or a palliation for the insurgents would be their own condemnation, and they therefore had declared that that death, which would be the indication that the extreme rigor of the law was the appropriate punishment, that death on the scaffold was needful in order to avert their own death here, and thus they had become disqualified for sound judgment.

THE CHARGE OF VENALITY.

In this connection I desire to say a word, and a word only, with reference to a charge highly calculated, if true, to increase the guilt, so far as he was morally responsible, of Reil. I refer to the charge of venality. I have already read that portion of the evidence of Nolin which shows the purpose to which the man stated he would apply the money which he was about to get from the Government—that he would apply it in starting a newspaper and in raising other nationalities in the States, and in affecting the prosecution of his designs. I say that however plainly that may appear to be a violent, a wicked, or a mad sentiment, it is utterly inconsistent with the charge of venality; it shows that this was the mode which, in his disordered mind, he thought would be most efficacious in order to accomplish the design for his people and for himself, as part of his people, which he entertained. But the very circumstance that he made that statement to Nolin to my mind proves that it is impossible that he could have made the proposal for a venal purpose. I know perfectly the prejudices which exist. I know how many men would like to ease their conscience by saying: Oh, this was a base, and venal man. But it would be an act of humiliating cowardice on the part of one who has formed another conclusion on this subject to bend to such prejudices, and to allow a name which must ever be deeply clouded and stained to receive another cloud or stain which he, at any rate, in my judgment,

does not deserve. Now, Sir, with reference to the

QUESTION OF THE INDIAN WARFARE,

I think that if there was one thing above another that nerved us the very instant we heard of this rising, to press on the Administration in every way we could, to take all the steps which they with their greater knowledge of the conditions up there might themselves deem necessary, and not to make a single suggestion that they were doing too much, it was the possibility of an Indian rising. The thought which immediately engaged us all was that there could not be a rising created by Riel and the half-breeds without imminent danger of an Indian rising, and that in the condition of the country we owed it to ourselves and to our humanity, to the isolated settlers all through that country to take very large steps, to make very great preparations that if possible we might anticipate, at any rate minimise, the terrible results that might flow from that rising. No man felt, no man feels more strongly than myself the dangers, the difficulties, and the probabilities of an Indian warfare, and therefore I am quite prepared to agree that if you are dealing with a man of perfectly sound intellect this would be very important as importing a very much deeper dye to the crime he was committing. But, Sir, I may say that I do not think that hon. gentlemen are entitled to rest the whole burden of this case upon that fact. In the first place we are to remember that the man himself was a half-breed; that he was partly of Indian blood; that those who were with him were half-breeds; that it was natural, in fact, in view of so large a part of their, though not of his, training, that that warfare should be adopted. In the second place, we can hardly hold our heads high with reference to this question of Indian warfare. Why, you remember the great fight between Wolfe and Montcalm at Quebec, and you remember the monument which celebrates that event and in which their names are joined. But Montcalm had amongst his forces a thousand Indian warriors, and an Indian warfare was going on in connection with these events. In the other part of the Provinces at the very same time the English were using the Indians in warfare; the Americans had used them in warfare. Why, Sir, it is but a few years ago that at the instance of my hon. friend from Brant we voted \$5,000 towards a monument to Joseph Brant. I suppose we all know something of the history of Joseph

Brant, and what a remarkable man he was. But to the end of his life Joseph Brant defended, with all his enlightened Christian views, the Indian system of warfare as, for their circumstances and under their circumstances, proper and necessary, barring the question of torture, as to which I am glad to say he took an entirely different view, as many remarkable persons among the Indians have done, from the ordinary line. So with reference to Tecumseh, a name perhaps hardly inferior to that of Joseph Brant. So that while we honour and refer to those persons, we cannot altogether forget this past in the present. Nor need we go so very far back. Why in the Lower Canadian rebellion there is a most interesting account of the feats of the Indians of Caughnawaga, who captured some sixty or seventy insurgents; but they were on the loyal side, and therefore it was a proper act. In the course of 1869-70, when Lieut.-Col. Dennis as conservator of the peace went into Manitoba and proposed to raise forces, he raised an Indian force. There fifty Indians under Chief Prince were enrolled as part of his forces, and they were doing garrison duty, which was all, fortunately, they were called upon to do at the time. The Government very properly disapproved of it, and they stopped it. They were thoroughly alive to the dangers and the improprieties of it. But it was not a crime of so deep a dye to engage the Indians and thus to create a great probability of an Indian warfare, as to prevent the late Lieut.-Col. Dennis from being raised immediately afterwards in the public service by those gentlemen, and being promoted in that service, and remaining in it until he was superannuated. Now, Sir, referring to another point, to

THE QUESTION OF THE OLD OFFENCE.

It is said by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and has been said very loudly, that my attitude on that subject entirely precludes me from condemning this execution. Well, with reference to the old offence. We must remember that there was a general amnesty announced by the Government by proclamation, on their responsibility covering not that particular offence, but covering all the political offences and disturbances. That amnesty was received with universal approbation. I do not remember a single voice or newspaper ever being raised against it. It was universally thought that the Government had done proper in issuing, and issuing

early, that particular amnesty. It did not, however, cover this particular offence; but the rising, the political part of the whole affair, the raising of men in rebellion, the creation of a Government, the organization of forces—all that was with the unanimous consent of the people of Canada amnestied. There remained, as I have said, the question of this particular offence. As to that, what was my attitude in 1871? It is the same as my attitude to-day. I thought then, as I said then, that in my opinion the death of Scott was a cruel murder. There is just one point in respect of which the discussions which have gone on within the last few months have tended to modify my view, and that is the very point to which I have been drawing the attention of the House this evening. It is questionable in my opinion—and those who read with the light which recent events and evidence have thrown upon these matters will agree with it, will see in much that has occurred the reason of that question—it is *questionable how far the mind of Riel may even at that early day have been thoroughly balanced*. I do not intend to discuss it; I allude to it as the only thing in regard to which there is an observation to be made which differs my attitude to-day from my attitude in 1870 with respect to that event. That being my attitude then and my attitude ever since, an attitude in which I was confirmed by Sir George E. Cartier, who called it a cruel murder, by Sir John A. Macdonald, who also stigmatised it as such and invoked his Maker to testify to his anxiety to catch the criminal—that being my attitude, I was exposed at that time to a storm of indignation, because I expressed the view that those who had been, as I conceived guilty of cruel murder should be brought to justice. I did my best to enforce that view. I am told that I did it without papers and I want papers now. I had papers; the Government had brought down the papers to the House; they had brought down the full account of the murder. I had Mr. Donald Smith's account and the account of other dignitaries—all the evidence on which a man could reasonably come to a conclusion in advance of a trial. What did I want? I wanted a trial; I wanted that the man should be brought to trial; and I thought then and I think now that I had quite ample evidence to justify me in stigmatising that event as a murder, and in calling that the perpetrator should be brought to trial.

FULL AMNESTY WAS GRANTED.

That being so, yet in the year 1875 I think I was amongst those who, though not of the Government, yet in our party councils, and subsequently in my place in Parliament, most strongly supported by voice and vote the proposition that there should be an amnesty in respect of that offence. I believed that the facts which were revealed before the special committee on the North-West troubles proved that we were in duty bound to grant that amnesty; that we were in honour bound to grant that amnesty; and so believing I acted upon that belief and sustained, as I have said, by every force in my power the proposition that an amnesty should be granted. That amnesty was a very effectual and complete transaction. It was not granted simply upon the responsibility of the Crown without the approval of the people's representatives. The people's representatives were asked to take the initiative, at the instance, of course, of the responsible Ministers of the Crown; and they did so by an overwhelming majority, in which you are to count not merely that very large majority that voted for the granting of that amnesty but also all those who voted for the granting of an unconditional amnesty and may have recorded their votes against this one because it was conditional. Now, Sir, here was a solemn amnesty—an act of oblivion.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF "AMNESTY"?

It is a blotting out of remembrance. What is the meaning of "oblivion"? It is the same. That is the technical meaning expressing the reality of these transactions; and it is in my opinion contrary to the spirit of our law that we should, at this time and under these circumstances, bring up the event which was so solemnly amnestied as a reason why the extreme penalty of the law should be inflicted if but for that event it should not be inflicted. Will you allow me to read a word or two that Sir Robert Peel used in the House of Commons when, at as early a period as 1825, he proposed a Bill for restoring the credit of criminals:

"By the spirit of the English Constitution every man who had satisfied the justice of the country by a pardon ought to be restored to the same situation as he was in before he committed any offence. . . . The Bill would also go to place persons whose sentence had been commuted in the full enjoyment of all their rights as free citizens. So when a capital convict has fulfilled his commuted sentence of seven years' transportation he was to be restored to all his 'credits and capacities.' . . . In God's name, when parties had

expiated their offence by fulfilling the sentence of the law, why should any exclusion remain against them? It was therefore provided by the Bill that whenever a party had undergone the punishment awarded by the court for any offence, he was then restored to all his rights, credits, and capacities in as full a manner as if no offence had been committed."

Much more solemnly can we apply such language to the case of a parliamentary amnesty such as was granted here. Now was he hanged for the old offence? If yes—if his sentence would have been commuted but for that, then he was in effect hanged for it; and this would be in effect to adopt the views of those who called for his blood on the ground of the death of Scott. But, Sir, if his intellect were disordered, how could the old offence be taken into consideration in administering the extreme punishment for the new? Incarceration for life was required; pardon would not have been right. That is one of the observations hon. gentlemen opposite make: "You say he ought to have been pardoned." I have not said so. *I say pardon would not have been right. The safety of the State, and his punishment, taking the strongest view against him of his mental condition, demanded incarceration; but the amnestied offence should not have hanged him.*

WAS RIEL EXECUTED AS A DETERRENT?

It is said the execution was needed as a deterrent. Sir Alexander Campbell in his report has declared that there never was a rebellion of which it might be so truthfully said that it was entirely the act of one man—that if he had not come there, or had been removed one day before it took place, the outbreak would not have taken place. Yet he said that as a deterrent to others against rebelling, it was necessary that he should be executed. I do not think so; I have not so ill an opinion of the people of the North-West. Incarceration would have been quite enough to deter, with all the other results which have followed from their unjustifiable rising. Justice and mercy, redress of grievances, and a proper attention to the rights and interests of the people, are the best deterrents. We ask, to-day, Sir, in our prayers that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, might be established amongst us through all generations; but I do not believe that it is by this man's blood that a step has been taken to accomplish that result. *I do not see how, on the score of necessity to deter, you can justify hanging a man of a disordered intellect.* That is a deterrent, it is true, but it is a deterrent to the continued existence of the principle of

capital punishment. Now, Sir, one word with reference to the

REPRIEVES AND THE DELAYS.

We have not yet heard a satisfactory explanation of the last reprieve. I do not desire to detain you on that subject; but I wish to advert to an authority upon it. In 1869 the Home Secretary, Mr Bruce, said this :

"In Windsor's case, again, although the enormity of the offence was undoubted, still the sentence having been postponed for six months in order that important questions of law might be determined, the right hon. gentleman had thought that it would not be right after that lapse of time to permit the prisoner to be executed."

Now the hon. Minister of Militia referred to what he called the evidence with regard to the

LETTER OF GENERAL MIDDLETON TO RIEL;

The question is, What does the letter fairly import? The authority of General Middleton is not of any consequence, if that were disputed, though I do not suppose it is. Now the question to my mind on this subject is just this: Is it for the honour and credit of the volunteers of Canada that it should be declared that that paper was sent in order to warrant the prisoner, if he surrendered himself, against lynch law? Is it to the credit and honour of the volunteers to say that it was necessary for a Major-General in the British army to give assurance to Riel and his council that they would not be lynched if they surrendered themselves? I should be sorry to come to any such conclusion; and then, the question remains: Was it not reasonable to believe that the result of this statement was, You shall not, in fact, be exposed to the very worst that you can possibly be exposed to if you are caught, that is death. I think the liberal interpretation of that letter, in the sense and spirit in which such letters and assurances have been interpreted in all events of this description, would have led to that conclusion. I turn to the subsequent question, the promise of inquiry and the expectations of commutation. I turn to the very important statement by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) on that subject, and to the language of the Ministerial press, and I say that those expectations ought not to have been aroused, that that attitude ought not to have been taken unless they were to be acted upon and abided by, truly, faithfully and loyally; because if they had not been aroused other steps might have been taken, other evidence might have been brought forward, other facts

might have been presented to the Executive, which naturally would not be brought forward if there was an understanding that there was to be an efficient inquiry. For my part I always believed there would be in this case a commutation, having regard to the circumstances and the testimony as to the prisoner's mind; and I believed that if there was doubt in the mind of the Government on the question of

THE MENTAL CONDITION OF THE PRISONER,

that doubt would have been attempted to be solved by an efficient and proper medical enquiry; particularly so when we find that Dr. Howard was not called. Now Dr. Howard said in Montreal he could do Riel no good, because under the law, although he obviously implied he did not agree with the law, he would have been obliged to prove that Riel was responsible. Of course he would. *He thought Riel was irresponsible and that the law was wrong.* He could not have disturbed the verdict, but his evidence would have been important as to the state of Riel's mind with a view to the awarding of punishment afterwards. So with *Archbishop Tache*, who we see in his letter declared that he had formed the conviction that for twenty years, with all his brilliant gifts, *this unfortunate man was the victim of megalomania and theomania.* So with reference to *Bishop Grandin*, whose letter the Minister of Militia read, dated June, in which the bishop characterizes Riel as a miserable maniac. So with reference to a number of pieces of evidence I have collected and gathered from newspapers which were accessible to Ministers, but which I will not trouble the House with at this hour. So with reference to the *diary*, which contains indubitable traces of a *disordered mind.* So with reference to the last effusion I have read, the prophecy of Regina, which no man can read without coming to the conclusion that he who wrote it was disordered in his mind. So with reference to the papers not brought down. I have been told that of the Orders in Council of the provisional government, which are in the custody of this Government, the very first is an order declaring Riel a prophet, something after the fashion of John the Baptist. I have shown you he called himself Elias and Peter, and this order I believe represents him as John the Baptist. The next order was one altering the days of the week, and so forth. All these things and many statements that were made, some of them at an earlier period as to circumstances which had

occurred, were worthy of attention. So were the letters written with reference to the trial. At the close of the trial the correspondent of the *Mail* reported that Dr. Clarke, after having heard the evidence which was called since Riel's examination, and after having heard the prisoner himself speak, was quite convinced he was insane. I say the case was one in which it was incumbent on the ADMINISTRATION, IF THEY FELT A DOUBT AS TO THE PROPRIETY OF COMMUTATION, TO HAVE A THOROUGH MEDICAL EXAMINATION AND ENQUIRY. The medical examination they caused was limited in scope. Sir John A. Macdonald's letter expressly points that out. We have not the instructions to these gentlemen, but Sir John's letter to the Minister of Militia pointed out that it was limited to the question whether Riel's condition had become so much worse since his trial that he was no longer capable of knowing right from wrong. It was not, therefore, such an inquiry as has been frequently made in cases infinitely weaker than this; it was not an inquiry which involved the real question: What was the condition of his mind at the time of the offence, which constituted the crime he committed? What was the condition of his mind before that time? So with reference to the very important point of hereditary insanity. I have read in the *Mail* the statement that his mother went into a state of absolute craziness during the rebellion, and a statement of her falling into the same condition at a subsequent period, when she heard of the conviction—a circumstance the importance of which, in considering what the real condition of this man's mind was, cannot be overstated, as must be extremely familiar to all those who have made mental alienation a study.

THESE GENTLEMEN WERE NOT SPECIALISTS.

Dr. Valade certainly was not. Dr. Lavell had very limited experience, having had, for a short number of years only, the charge of the criminal lunatics in the Kingston penitentiary, because up to a comparatively recent period the criminal lunatics were transferred to Rockwood, which was under other orders. Dr. Lavell also, if I be rightly informed as to his views upon a late occasion, that of Lee's examination, was a very improper person sent to find Riel sane or insane, because upon that occasion, if I am rightly informed, his opinion was that the man was sane, though the others found him insane. The experts also who had been examined at the trial took no part in the subsequent examina-

tion, except perhaps Dr. Jukes, who did not take any real part in it. Then we have not the reports of the commission, we have only this edition of their reports which has been laid on the Table, and we do not know what their instructions were or what were the reports on which the Government acted. I say, however, that for the purpose of a proper discharge of the duties of the Executive in cases of disordered intellect though not amounting to irresponsibility, those reports, even such as they are brought down, were of the highest importance. They prove the genuine existence of delusions and hallucinations on the subjects of religion and politics, on the very subjects on which the delusions and hallucinations were proved, in respect of which the crime was committed. They show that these were persistent, and *my conclusion is clear that Riel was so disordered in mind as not, within the accepted rule, to have been a proper subject for the capital sentence.* It is impossible, in case of serious delusion or so-called monomania, to be sure how far the flaw has affected the conduct in question. It may not have affected it in some cases, though whether it did or not is very frequently a question beyond the wit of man to determine. But here we know it did, because we know that the flaw had regard to these very two points of religion and politics upon which this rising and these events turned. Criminal responsibility, then, for public security there may and must be, though there may be some mental disorder; but not responsibility unto death. And here again come in the political nature of the offence, the general rules relating to these offences, and the special circumstances of the conduct of the Government in this matter; and my belief, therefore, is that the maximum sentence for the same crime of which Riel was convicted, had he been tried under the milder procedure of the modern law under which his colleagues were tried, namely, imprisonment for life, would have been

THE PROPER AND ADEQUATE DISPOSITION

of his case. But if the Government doubted this there was an imperative call for thorough and efficient inquiry, for an inquiry going far beyond what was possible at Regina, and extending to the condition of the criminal not only at that moment but at other times; there was imperative ground for such an inquiry before a determination should be reached, that the sentence should be executed. My own opinion is, then, that A GREAT WRONG HAS BEEN DONE, AND A GREAT BLOW

HAS BEEN INFLICTED UPON THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE; AND FOR THIS THE EXECUTIVE IS RESPONSIBLE TO US. I know the atmosphere of prejudice and passion which surrounds this case; I know how difficult it will be for years to come to penetrate that dense atmosphere; I know how many people of my own race and of my own creed entertain sentiments and feelings hostile to the conclusion to which I have been driven; I know that many whom I esteem and in whose judgment I have confidence, after examination of this case, have been unable to reach my own conclusion. I blame no one. Each has the right and duty to examine and judge for himself. But cries have been raised on both sides which are potent, most potent in preventing the public from coming to a just conclusion; yet we must not, by any such cries, be deterred from doing our duty.

I HAVE BEEN THREATENED

more than once by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate with political annihilation in consequence of the attitude of the Liberal party which they projected on this question; and I so far agree with them as to admit that

the vote I am about to give is an inexpedient vote, and that, if politics were a game, I should be making a false move. I should be glad to be able to reach a conclusion different from that which is said by hon. gentleman opposite to be likely to weaken my influence and imperil my position. But it can be said of none of us, least of all of the humble individual who now addresses you, that his continued possession of a share of public confidence, of the lead of a party, or of a seat in Parliament, is essential or even highly important to the public interest; while for all of us what is needful is not that we should retain, but that we should deserve the public confidence; not that we should keep, but that while we do keep we should honestly use our seats in Parliament. To act otherwise would be to grasp at the shadow and to lose the substance; *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*. We may be wrong: we must be true. We should be ready to close, but resolved to keep unstained our public careers. I am unable honestly to differ from the view that it is deeply to be regretted that this execution should have been allowed to take place, and therefore in favour of that view I must record my vote.

THE DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON THE HOME RULE RESOLUTIONS, MAY, 1886 (CONDENSED).

On the motion to go into Committee of Supply, on May 4th, 1886, Mr. Blake made the following speech :

MR. BLAKE. I rise for a moment to intercept that question in order to bring before the House another, in which the last House showed a deep concern—I mean the Irish question. In 1880 I spoke my views upon this subject, and expressed my belief and hope that we should at no distant day see a measure of Home Rule granted to Ireland. In the year 1882 the question was moved on the other side of this House. At that time we, on this side, heartily co-operated in order to give the greatest possible weight to the proposed action. Then I spoke at length my opinions upon the whole question, which saves me from the necessity of trespassing now upon the time of this House, and since that time to the best of my humble power here and elsewhere I have aided in the advancement of that cause. Since then a new Canadian House of Commons has been elected, which House has not yet spoken upon the question. Since then great events have transpired in the United Kingdom itself. The people both of Ireland and Great Britain, have received for the first time a very full measure of representation in Parliament. The Irish people, under that measure of representation have by an enormous, an overwhelming majority, pronounced in favour of Home Rule, and the great statesman who leads Her Majesty's Government has recognized the vital necessity of grappling at once with the question ; and Her Majesty's Government have, as I ventured to suggest on a former occasion, seen the propriety of themselves formulating a plan for the settlement of that question. Now, Sir, a controversy has arisen on some of the more important details of that measure. I do not myself admire all those details. For example, admitting the great difficulties, I should yet prefer to the present plan for the exclusion of Ireland from the management of Imperial affairs in which she is interested, her continued representation for those Im-

perial purposes in an Imperial Parliament. I should prefer the plan, notwithstanding its great difficulty, of her retaining that share of control. But it needs not to discuss this or any other matter of detail, because it has been expressly and authoritatively stated that none of these points are considered in any way vital to the question which is now before England and before the world. The vital principle now at stake is that of self-government for Ireland in local affairs. This was stated by Mr. Gladstone in his reply to the criticisms on the first reading of the Bill, and he has further and authoritatively declared it by his recent manifesto, which was transmitted to us only yesterday. In that manifesto, he thus speaks :

“ As for the means we take the establishment in Dublin of a legislative body empowered to make laws for Irish, as contra-distinguished from Imperial affairs. It is with this that we are busied, and not with details and particulars ; their time will come.”

He adds :

“ We are not debating the amount of Irish contributions to the Empire, of the composition of the legislative body, or the maintenance of representative connection with Westminster. On these questions and many more we may and we may not be at odds ; but what we are at this moment debating is the large and far larger question which includes and I think absorbs them all—the question whether you will or will not have regard to the prayer of Ireland for the management by herself of affairs specifically and exclusively her own. This and no other is the matter which the House of Commons has at once to decide. If on this matter it speaks with a clear and intelligible voice, I feel the strongest assurance that the others, difficult as some of them are, will nevertheless with the aid of full discussion and with the aid of a wise and conciliatory spirit be found capable of a rational and tolerable settlement.”

Now, Sir, that Bill to which this manifesto refers stands for a second reading in a few days, and then that vital question is to be decided. A great excitement has arisen ; the Empire has been aroused ; not merely the Kingdom, but the Empire. The emotion has passed beyond the seas ; it has passed beyond the Empire ; the English speaking people outside the bounds of the Empire

have been aroused ; nay more, the free nations all over the world have been moved. Every eye is at this moment bent on Westminster, and every ear is strained to catch the echoes when they come of the great debate, and to learn the issue of the mighty struggle from beyond. Under these circumstances marks of sympathy and of admiration have been cabled to the First Minister, and he has responded to them in such a sort as proves conclusively that he regards them, as they must be, helpful to him in, the enormous task he has undertaken. We know as well as if we had received it already what the tone of the reply will be to any such communication as we have on a former occasion addressed, or as other large bodies have addressed, upon this subject. The circumstances are of course changed ; they are changed since the day we addressed Her Majesty ; they are changed as to the position of the question ; but they are changed in this particular also, to which I call your special attention. * At that time we assumed—and I suppose we are not now prepared to resile ; I am not, at any rate, prepared to resile from the assumption of our right respectfully to approach the Throne with a view to tender our humble advice and hopes upon a subject of such vital importance to the whole Empire, and to Canada as a part of the Empire. But, Sir, at this time not merely in other particulars are the circumstances changed, but they are changed in this : That whereas when we were asked to accede to the view that we should assume the responsibility of respectfully tendering that advice and opinion to Her Majesty's Government, that Government had not acted. Now we can say that Her Majesty's Government, whether upon that advice or not, have acted in accordance with the spirit of that advice, and that we are no longer called upon by any sense of duty, and it is unnecessary that we should tender them any advice. What we are called upon now to do under the present circumstances is to assist them, so far as we can, by giving them our moral support in furtherance of the views which they have expressed, and in the adoption of the principles of the scheme now before Parliament. The answers which have been given to the communications which have been received show their helpfulness. To the Speaker of the Quebec Assembly, in response to their resolution, Mr. Gladstone writes :

"I am deeply grateful at the resolution adopted by your honorable body. It is my belief that the people of England, who have partial responsibility

for the old misdeeds of the British Government, and the people of Ireland who have really none, will concur in the wise and liberal view entertained by the Quebec Assembly."

To the Mayor of Boston, in answer to the resolution of the city, he cabled :

"I feel that American opinion, allied as it is with a regard and affection for the Old Country, affords Her Majesty's Government a powerful moral support."

Then, shall we be slack to-day ? Shall we be silent now who spoke before ? I say, No. We are bound to speak and speak now. Else it will be said of us : "You spoke ere the question was ripe, when your words embarrassed ; now that it is near, even at the door, you withhold your help." Else it will be inferred that we have changed our minds, and that no longer does the House of Commons approve of self-government for Ireland. Our silence to-day will be as positively hurtful as our speech to day would be helpful. It was but yesterday that we were, in effect, appealed to. Listen to the words of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto. He appeals, indeed, directly, in the words which I am about to read, to the masses of the population of Great Britain ; and this is what he says :

"Watching from day to day the movement of the currents of opinion during the present conflict, more and more I find it vital to observe the point at which the dividing lines are drawn on the side adverse to the Government. They are found, as I sorrowfully admit, in profuse abundance, in station, title, wealth, social influence and the professions, and the large majority of them in the world, spirit and power of class. These are the main body of the opposing host. Nor is this all. As knights of old had squires, so in the great army of class each enrolled soldier has a roll of dependants. The adverse host, then, consists of class and dependants of class ; but this formidable army is the bulk of its constituents, part of the same, though now enriched at our cost, with a valuable contingent of recruits that has fought in every Government the greatest political battles of the last sixty years, and has been defeated. We have a great aim. For us now it is to restore your parliamentary efficiency, by dividing and by removing obstacles to its work ; to treat the Irish question with due regard to its specialities, but with the same thoroughness of method by which we have solved colonial problems that fifty years back were hardly if at all less formidable ; to give heed to the voice of the people, speaking in tones of moderation, by the mouth of the vast majority of those whom we ourselves have made its constitutional representatives, and thus to strengthen and consolidate the Empire on the basis of mutual benefit and hearty loyalty."

I ask whether we, too, though that appeal is not a direct appeal to us, we too, a democratic people, kinsmen of those he addresses, of that very mass of the population to which Mr. Gladstone speaks, shall not echo and

further his appeal. He describes in the same manifesto the response from the world. Thus he speaks :

“ Never have I known an occasion when a parliamentary event so rang through the world as the introduction of this Bill, under the auspices of the British Government. From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the Colonies, from capitals such as Washington, Cincinnati, Boston, Quebec, and from the remotest districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive the conclusive assurance that kindred people regard it with warm and fraternal sympathy. Our present effort is to settle on an adequate scale, and once for all, the long-vexed and troubled relations between England and Ireland, which exhibit to us the only one conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race, to confront and master a difficulty, and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of civilized life.”

I ask under those circumstances, and when the highest testimony is given to those resolutions from various quarters as to their utility, shall Canada who was earliest in the field be dumb to-day? Shall her voice, so loud before, be silent now? Shall we not listen to that mute appeal and cause our names to be enrolled amongst those who constitute the forces of the great public opinion throughout the world, giving an added impulse to the progress of this great measure? I dare not be silent longer. I do not bring this as a party question. I have waited till the last moment, hoping that some one on the other side of the House would move. That hope I have been obliged to abandon. I see that the Minister of Inland Revenue has declined to move, and has cabled for himself and for the Irish representatives in Parliament the assurance of his and their adhesion to the address of 1882. I do not undervalue his assurance, but it is not the assurance required. What is required is the assurance not of one, but of all classes; not of a section, but of the people; not of a Minister of the Crown, but of the Commons of Canada; not of the Irish Catholic members, but of the French and English, Scotch, Irish and German, of all creeds and of all nationalities. To substitute the hon. gentleman's assurance for our voice would be to acknowledge that we do not choose now to speak in the sense in which we spoke then, and in which he declares his own readiness to speak again. I therefore speak, but not as a Reformer, or a party leader; I speak as a Canadian and citizen of the Empire to brother Canadians and fellow-citizens of the Empire. This not a Protestant or a Catholic question; they are enemies of their country who would make it so. It should not be,

in Canada at all events, a Conservative or a Reform measure. I regard those as the enemies of their country who would try to make it so. I hope that we may by our own action this day show ourselves united in the redress of wrongs and in the advancement of the cause of liberty. For my part I should feel myself nothing less than a coward and a criminal should we, without any effort of mine, stand passive to-day and fail to lend our help at this critical moment to the cause of freedom and local self-government for the Irish people. I therefore move to leave out all the words after “that” and insert the following :

An humble address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada and the people whom they represent in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government, still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882 when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an address, to the terms to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion.

Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland.

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

[NOTE.—The debate was adjourned under an arrangement between Mr. Blake and Sir John Macdonald by which the subject should be taken up as a substantive motion; and it was resumed on May 6.]

MR. BLAKE. In pursuance of the Orders of the Day, and for the reasons I stated on Tuesday, no intimation having reached me from any member of the House that any portion of this motion is, in its form or substance, objectionable, I beg to move the address of which I gave notice on Tuesday, expressing the joy this House experiences by the submission of a measure in the Imperial Parliament recognizing the principle of local self-government for Ireland.

MR. COSTIGAN. It is no secret, nor did I intend that it should be, because full publicity was given to the facts, that representative men of one very prominent Irish society of this city called upon me, urging the propriety of moving some resolution on this question. Their object, of course, was not to consult with me as to the desirability, or otherwise,

of taking that step, because those who have read the reports of the proceedings of the society will see that, in the first place, the society decided that that was the proper step to take, that some resolution should be moved, and they then decided that a committee should ask me to take that step. The reasons that I gave them, I think, hold good at present. I stated, and I repeat now, that if on that occasion we had not been successful, and whether hopeful of success now or not, if we had failed on that occasion we might and it would be our duty to make another attempt to gain an expression of sympathy from so important a body as this is. Then having succeeded beyond, as I stated before, the most sanguine expectations of the most earnest Irishmen in this country in obtaining a unanimous expression of sympathy from this Parliament in favour of the Irish people and the constitutional agitation they were carrying on for the attainment of that system of Government and those constitutional privileges which we enjoy in this country and cherish so highly, I believed for one that it was not only not prudent or advisable, but that we had no just reason for asking Parliament to take this question up again. I noticed that in some of the city papers giving my reasons for refusing to move in that direction when I was called upon to do so, it was declared that I stated that my reason was that I feared the defeat of the resolution. I deny ever having made such a statement. I entertain no such fear. I am quite satisfied that the Parliament of Canada, that the representative men in this country are always ready and willing to give an expression consistent with the privileges and the Constitution under which we live, and that there is no man in Canada who would not be willing to see his fellow-men in any part of the globe enjoying the privileges of free and self-government which we enjoy in Canada. I did say, however, that as we could not expect to get Parliament to give a stronger expression of opinion, what would be the object of introducing the question again, when the risk might be to get a weaker expression of opinion. I did not say that the question would be defeated. I did not entertain such a belief at all, but it is possible that some division might take place, that some one man or some two members, or three or four, if you will, might differ from the views taken by the majority of the House of Commons on that occasion, and therefore to that extent the expression would be that much weakened. . . . I, therefore, beg

leave to move in amendment to the motion, seconded by Sir Hector Langevin :

That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—the Commons of Canada desire to express their deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and their adhesion to the sentiments expressed in the Joint Address to Her Majesty of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament passed in the Session of 1882;

That in such Address Parliament suggested that Canada and its inhabitants had prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and expressed a hope "that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority were fully protected and secured, some means might be found of meeting the expressed desires of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects in that regard."

That in answer to the said Address the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was commanded to state that "Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs, but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the Constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

That this House, having reference to the tenor of the said answer, does not deem it expedient again to address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that such a measure or such measures may be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well-being of the Empire and the rights and status of the minority, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country.

MR. CASEY. . . . If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) asks for reasons why we should renew that expression of opinion, I have plenty to give him. First, because this is a new parliament. After that expression of opinion in 1882 the members of this House went to their constituents, and if the constituents objected to the course taken in 1882 they had means of showing it. I do not think there is anything in the result of that election to show that they did object to that expression of opinion. But we do wish to put on record the fact that this House of Commons, after the expression of opinion given by the former House of Commons and after consulting the constituents, entertains the same opinion that the House held four years ago. That is one reason for renewing the expression of opinion. Another reason is, and it is a still stronger one, because now Home Rule is a practical issue. . . . Now it is a practical issue; now something has been proposed; now a measure, however defective some of us may think it, has been submitted to

the British House of Commons, and apparently it has a possibility at least of being adopted in principle, a measure adopting, at all events the great theory of Home Rule, however we may differ from the details proposed in that measure. Now I say is the time when our re-expression of opinion will be useful. . . .

But now, when Home Rule has ripened, when Home Rule is in process of being granted to Ireland, an expression of opinion coming from this House, of which the great majority is known to be Conservative, would not be looked upon as a political dodge, but would be looked upon as a sincere and earnest attempt to strengthen the hands of those who are working for justice to Ireland. . . .

We asserted in 1882 our right to petition the Throne in regard to a matter which we declared to be of Imperial significance, but which we declared to have material bearings on the prosperity of Canada as well. . . . I say that the acceptance of that Resolution by this House appears to me to be an acceptance of the snub which was administered to this House, by the then Secretary of the Colonies, at the time we sent the former resolution. . . .

I object to taking the ground that because they would not hear us before we will not speak to them now, when they are willing to hear us. . . . What is the meaning of the remarks of Mr. Gladstone in his late manifesto? Is it not a recognition that not only Quebec, a French Province living under British rule, filled now with British sympathy and love for British constitutional Government, not only a French Province like Quebec, but even States entirely severed from the Empire, are members of the great British family council, composed of the offspring that have come from the loins of that great nation? Is it not a recognition of our fellow-citizenship in the British Empire? I say it is. Is it more than a recognition of our right to speak in that family council. It is an invitation to lay our opinions before the head of that family, with the assurance that those opinions will be accepted with gratitude and regarded with the favour and respect that their importance deserves. . . .

Though of Irish descent, and though proud of that descent, I hope I shall be able to discuss this question rather as a Canadian than as an Irishman. I hold that Home Rule is as much a principle of the Canadian people, is a sentiment as dear to the Canadian heart, as it is to that of native Irishmen. I mean Home Rule in the general sense, not merely as applied to Ireland, but as applied to all isolated communities who claim the right to

manage their own affairs. . . . The Legislature of Quebec has given an almost unanimous declaration of opinion in favour of Home Rule, thereby inferring that Home Rule has worked well with them. Another parallel exists in the fact that there is a large Protestant minority in Ireland whose rights some people fear will be injured by the concession of Home Rule to that country. There is a large Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. Has Home Rule in Quebec been disastrous to the Protestant minority? I do not think any member of this House will contend that it has. It is evident that the English-speaking members of the Quebec Assembly do not think it has, for they have given their assent to the principle of Home Rule. And is it to be asserted that the people of Ireland, with whom so many of us are allied by race, are less reliant or less disposed to live at peace and harmony among themselves under Home Rule than the people of Quebec? I repudiate the assertion, if anyone is hardy enough to make it. . . .

I will give my support to the resolution introduced by my hon. friend as leader, and in the second place, if that resolution should not meet the acceptance of the House to whatever form of words may be agreed upon by the House and to which we can give our unanimous support; while I maintain, at the same time a strong preference for the form of proceeding we have already adopted. In this I believe I am only doing my duty, not as an Irishman, but as a Canadian. I believe the action this House will take will greatly strengthen the hands of the venerable statesman who is risking all the fruits of a great and long career to do what he conceives to be just to Ireland, and who is doing this at the risk of losing the support of many who have been his friends through life. In that position he demands the sympathy of the world, and I hope he will receive the sympathy not only of Reformers but of Conservatives as well throughout British countries. . . .

Mr. CURRAN . . . Will it be for the advantage of Ireland that such a resolution should be brought forward? In view of what has been said in the press, in view of the imputation which was cast upon us, in view more particularly of the unanimous vote cast in this House in 1882, a more emphatic expression than which this could not possibly have been given, we thought, Sir, it would be impossible for us to secure anything more forcible, and that it was desirable to let the matter stand before the world,

before the eyes of Mr. Gladstone, who had received it and who had returned it in the contemptuous manner that has been referred to, that was the unanimous expression of this Parliament. It has never been appealed. No one had stood up in this Parliament and asked that a different opinion should be recorded, and we felt under the circumstances, and not only those gentlemen, but the best Home Rulers in this country whom I have consulted, those who have given their time, their money and their energy to the cause, also felt that unless we could secure a unanimous vote again in this House, or something tantamount thereto, it was in the interest of Ireland that the old resolutions should stand, which had been carried by a unanimous vote, and that they should not be disturbed. . . .

This body does not feel it necessary to present an Address to Her Majesty, but I may say that the course which has been adopted by the leader of the Opposition not only does not meet the views of those who may be supposed to speak for the Irish people of the Dominion, but it meets with their entire disapprobation. . . . A very great difficulty indeed exists, as has been pointed out in such a plain manner by the Minister of Inland Revenue, in view of the reception which our last Address received, when Mr. Gladstone himself advised Her Majesty to tell us in plain language that while the Government of England would always be ready to receive any advice we might have to offer upon Canadian affairs, yet, so far as regards Imperial concerns, Canada had better mind her own business. . . .

Now, Sir, the substance of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blake) resolution may be all right enough, but according to his own friends, according to common-sense ideas and a due regard for our own dignity, we cannot adopt by any possibility the form which he has adopted, the form which brought this answer from the Earl of Kimberley, whilst we have an equally effective mode; a mode that will involve no discourtesy towards this House, if it exists; a mode by which the Parliament places upon its records and publishes to the world what its views are upon this question in its present state in the Imperial Parliament. . . .

Mr. McMULLEN, who was received with groans by Government supporters, said:—Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is right that any Irishman should get a groan in this House. I claim to be an Irishman just as much as the gentlemen who have already addressed the House on this question. I believe

I am just as true an Irishman as any who sits within this Chamber. I was born on the old sod; I lived there for a good many years; I have visited it and travelled through it frequently. I love and reverence the green hills of Ireland just as much as any man in this House; and when I, in my humble way, rise to offer a few words in the interest of this important question, I think I am just as fairly entitled to a hearing as any man who sits in this House. . . . The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has told us that the Irishmen of this House and the Irishmen of the Senate had a meeting and talked the whole question over, and he said that every Irishman in this House and in the Senate was present. Well, Sir, I claim to be an Irishman, and I was not there; I heard nothing of the meeting, and I do not believe there is an Irishman on this side of the House who heard anything of it. I would like to know if the hon. leader of the Opposition heard anything of it?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CURRAN. I spoke of Irish Catholic members and Senators.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a Catholic question, is it?

Mr. CURRAN. No, it is not, but you are trying to make a Grit question of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is so exceedingly narrow-minded on this question. I would like to know if the resolution carried in this House in 1882 was carried only by the vote of Irish Catholic members. I would like to know if both Catholic and Protestant members did not support that resolution. Mr. Parnell is not a Catholic, and why should the hon. gentleman narrow the question down to Catholics?

. . . . Now, if we could take the resolution that has been presented by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the amendment that has been presented by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and place those two resolutions in the hands of Mr. Gladstone and in the hands of Mr. Parnell, I venture to say that their decision would be, let us have the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. . . . I believe if years ago Ireland had got Home Rule, we would to day have more Irishmen living in Canada, which would be a decided advantage to us. Any man who will travel through Ireland, as I have and witness the evidence of ancient greatness on every hand and the unfortunate condition of things to-day which stand out in strong contrast to those evidences of past grandeur, will come to the conclusion that something is wanted. . . .

If Ireland got Home Rule, she would use it cautiously and carefully, knowing that the eyes of the world would be turned upon her to see whether she would really use the privilege granted to her with prudence and care. I believe the Catholic majority would deal out to the Protestant minority an ample share of free treatment, and that the latter would not suffer in the slightest. I believe it is the incumbent duty of this House to express our opinion on this question, and not to present our resolution in the emasculated style proposed by the Minister of Inland Revenue. I think the leader of the Opposition has given ample evidence of his sincerity, first, by introducing the resolution in a broad and comprehensive style, and secondly, by the very admirable speech in which he supported it. Did not the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) try to impress on the House the absolute necessity that its expression of opinion should be unanimous, not as a party question, but as an expression of Canadian public sentiment, with the object of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands by securing to him the prestige which would arise from our action and our experience in the matter of Home Rule? The hon. gentleman also spoke with regard to the attitude of the *Globe* and *Mail*. Well, any person in the habit of reading the *Globe* can come to no other conclusion than that the *Globe* is a consistent advocate of Home Rule. Its course on that question has been advocated in that bold and liberal spirit in which that newspaper agitates every question it takes in hand. But what has been the course of the *Mail*? The *Mail* played shy for a long time. It followed the course which is usually followed by the leader of the Government in an important question. It wanted, first, to see how the wind would blow, to see what course would be taken by its leaders, and after a long time it mustered courage enough to come out and express opposition to Home Rule. Irishmen have not much to thank the *Mail* for. They will be able to see through the course taken by the *Mail* and by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not believe they will be a party to this scheme of blinding the eyes of those who sympathise with Home Rule and hoodwinking the Irish population. . . . I suppose we shall have an address from others on that side of the House on this subject. No doubt the member for Montreal and the Minister of Inland Revenue will not be allowed to stand alone. No doubt the first Minister will address the House. We expect him to. No

doubt we shall hear from the Minister of Customs, he is an Irishman.

Mr. BOWELL. You are wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. We also expect the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to speak. Surely he is going to say a word on this question.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), surely we will have a word from him on this question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am opposed to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. All these men will rise, and they will deplore the unfortunate spirit that actuated the leader of the Opposition in introducing a question of this kind without consulting hon. gentlemen opposite. . . . I am rather disposed to think that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all their valued loyalty as Conservatives, are disposed to ignore the Queen in this question. . . . There is not a man in this House, who will deny that poor, unfortunate Ireland has suffered for years for the want of that measure of Home Rule that we believe would be pleasant to her. They attack the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry to say that there are some men of Irish parentage who have been so neglectful of the honour they owe to their parent land, that in the moment of her struggles, and of Mr. Gladstone's efforts in her behalf, they have stood, while clothed with the honour of being representatives in this House, clothed with the privilege of discharging the duty of representatives of constituencies that, in many cases, have a large number of Irishmen—they have stood still for nine weeks without offering one word of encouragement to the leaders of the Home Rule movement, or presenting any resolution in order to back up Mr. Gladstone in the enormous task he has undertaken. . . . I contend that we should go farther than the resolution itself. If the amendment had added force to the resolution it should have been seriously considered. I must again express regret that the question has not been approached in a spirit of liberality and fairness by hon. gentlemen opposite. . . . Being desirous as an Irishman to do everything in my power to aid the efforts being put forth by Mr. Gladstone in favour of Home Rule, I beg to move an amendment to the amendment:

To leave out all the words in the amendment after "that" and insert the following words in addition thereto, after the word "adhesion":

"And that this House is confirmed and strengthened by the events which have occurred since the

passage of the said address in its convictions that the true interests both of Ireland and the rest of the Empire will be served in the highest degree by the granting of Home Rule to Ireland."

Mr. BURNS. . . . In 1882, in the face of opposition from his own party, he (Mr. Costigan) introduced into the House a series of resolutions, which were carried unanimously, or almost unanimously. . . . The facts are as stated by the Minister, that it was suggested to him that resolutions of this kind should be introduced, but after consultation with those with whom he was associated, with his countrymen if you will, it was deemed inexpedient, or unnecessary rather, that resolutions of this nature should be introduced.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It seems, Sir, to be assumed by all who have yet spoken on this question, that this House is unanimous in an expression of an opinion in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, as embodied in the Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone, or in some similar measure, as to pass in favour of that question by unanimous consent. Now, Sir, I, for one, view with the very gravest apprehension as to the result, not only to Ireland and the best interests of Ireland, but also to the Empire at large, of the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone. . . . I congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) upon the position in which he stands, and upon his peculiar suitability for the position he has taken as the mover of this resolution. I hope this remark will not be considered out of order. He poses—I withdraw that word, because it implies a charge of insincerity; but that hon. gentleman stands in the position, among laymen, of a declared supporter of evangelical Protestantism in Ontario; AND YET HE COMES FORWARD AS THE CHAMPION OF A MEASURE WHICH EVERY PROTESTANT IN IRELAND VIEWS AS DANGEROUS AND PERILOUS TO HIS LIBERTIES. . . . There never was a system of coercion in Ireland to be compared with the terrorism exercised by the Land League since Mr. Parnell was placed at the head of it; and it is somewhat singular that any one can be found to support a body whose recognized agents have endeavoured, and unfortunately too often successfully, to carry out their measures by the vilest crimes that any man can possibly conceive of. Hon. gentlemen will remember that upon this day four years ago, two men who landed in Ireland charged with a message of peace, which, if there had been time given to utter it, might have very much changed the position of affairs, but which they were not allowed to

utter, were cut off by assassination. . . . I utterly repudiate the idea that those gentlemen who support Mr. Parnell's doctrines as to what is best for the Government of Ireland, can be said to represent what is popularly called the Irish people, except so far as they speak for their own following in that country. I want that hon. gentleman to understand—and I think I am perfectly justified in making the remark—that there is a very large population in Ireland who have no sympathy with Mr. Parnell's doctrines or his movements, and who do not recognize him in any way as a leader. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether an Ulster Orangeman or a Protestant from the west of Ireland has not just as much right to speak in this House on behalf of that portion of the population of Ireland who are opposed to the principle of Home Rule, who look upon it as disastrous and perilous to their best interests, as anyone who believes in the position assumed by Mr. Parnell. Now, Sir, I for one occupy precisely the same position as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I am the descendant of an Irish family, which at least has borne a not ignoble part in the history of that country; and I say, as representing that class of Irishmen, that I protest against any measure such as that introduced by Mr. Gladstone, which bristles with objectionable features, and which I think should be defeated on the ground that if it is passed something worse must follow. When the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue or other hon. gentlemen undertake to speak on behalf of the people of Ireland, I think it only fair to mention that at least one-third of the population of Ireland, including the great bulk of the Protestant population and a large minority of the Roman Catholics, who do not believe in the doctrines of Mr. Parnell, look on Mr. Gladstone's measure as disastrous to the country, and have protested and do protest in the strongest manner against it. . . . But, Sir, the most serious objection to that measure, and that we, as Canadians, are most entitled to consider, apart from any sympathy which we may feel, as I do, with that Protestant minority, is that it is regarded by Mr. Parnell and his followers, whatever may be said to the contrary, as a mere lever by which they may accomplish what they really desire, that is the complete isolation and independence of Ireland. I AM DISINCLINED TO SAY ANYTHING, WHICH, HOWEVER REMOTELY MAY TEND TO STRENGTHEN MR. GLADSTONE IN THIS MEASURE. . . . How many hon. mem-

bers here who are prepared to vote on the resolution proposed even to know anything or have read anything about Irish affairs? Have they ever considered what will be the position of what is called the minority, and what will be the effect, commercially, if this measure should pass? Are we to gratify the wishes of what I honestly believe to be nothing more than a faction, who have sincerity, no doubt, but are actuated by motives that fall short of anything like true patriotism. HOLDING THESE VIEWS, BELIEVING AS I DO THAT THIS MEASURE IS ONE THAT OUGHT NOT TO PASS THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT, I RAISE MY VOICE HERE IN PROTEST AGAINST IT; AND, AS FAR AS VOTING UPON THE RESOLUTIONS NOW BEFORE THE HOUSE IS CONCERNED, I SHALL VOTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OF MR. COSTIGAN SIMPLY ON THIS GROUND—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. O'BRIEN. HON. GENTLEMEN MAY CHEER, BUT LET ME FINISH MY SENTENCE—SIMPLY THAT IT IS JUST THE ONE RESOLUTION OF ALL THE THREE THAT I THINK IS LIKELY TO HAVE THE LEAST EFFECT.

MR. LANDERKIN. . . . A short time ago, you will remember that, when it was announced that that distinguished statesman who leads the Government of the British Empire, the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, was about to propose a measure for the amelioration of this condition of affairs in Ireland, that he had a measure to propose that he thought would bring about peace, would relieve the distress, and stay the crime that had marked itself in Ireland for the past half century or more, the nations of the world stood as it were on tip-toe anxiously awaiting the utterances of that distinguished statesman. . . . It is the desire of every patriotic man in this House that the wrongs under which Ireland has suffered shall be redressed, that the landlordism that has existed and that has oppressed the poor tenants in that country shall be done away with, that eviction and coercion of every kind shall be taken away from the law that governs Ireland, and Ireland shall yet be free, shall have her own Parliament, shall make her own laws, shall have her own Home Rule in effect. Well, this is natural, that we should sympathise with the distinguished statesman who has brought in this measure, a measure which, by reason of the traditions, by reason of those conditions that have existed in the hearts of other parts of the British Empire—traditions that have been formed, prejudices that have been grounded in the people—has

met with much opposition; but it is the desire of true Canadians and true Britons that Ireland may receive that measure of justice which she has clamoured for, which she has demanded, and which she has a right to expect. Are the Irish people, because they ask liberty, to be stamped out as rebels? Are the Canadians who desire a change in our constitution to be said to be rebels? Are those who are now in this country seeking a change in our constitution and desiring Imperial Federation rebels? The First Minister himself is advocating radical changes in the constitution of this country, and for that is he a rebel? And is Mr. Gladstone, when he is addressing wrongs, stamping out injuries which have existed for centuries in Ireland, not deserving the support, the united support of this Parliament in the most important dependency of the British Empire, supposed to be represented by those who are true to the parent stem from whence we sprang? Now, Sir, in reference to the resolution introduced here some years ago, strongly as I felt that the wrongs of Ireland should be redressed, I saw that there was no practicable measure before the Imperial Parliament, and I thought it was inexpedient to introduce the question here, it appeared to me to be devised for the purpose of securing popularity to those who introduced it. It would not look to be sincere and an honest thing. But to-day, when there is a practicable scheme, we see the author of the resolution in 1882 now shrinking from enforcing the principles he professes to admire. . . . I think the member for Muskoka described Parnell as a robber, or something of that kind, and here we have the Government, through the Minister of Inland Revenue communicating with a gentleman whom the member for Muskoka dubs as a rebel, or something worse. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think all the lovers of freedom in this House will support the amendment to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I rather favour that. There is a word in the motion proposed by the leader of the Opposition which I would like to see left out. I will read the first sentence and point out the word, which I think might be left out, because it gives it a narrowness which the motion ought not to have. I wish to see that one word "Irish" left out, and "Her Majesty's subjects" inserted.

MR. BLAKE. I would explain to the hon. gentleman, that that word is in the original address, which I was following in that paragraph, and that is the reason it is there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the address passed in 1882?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is quite satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The explanation as given, is somewhat satisfactory no doubt; but it is not quite satisfactory to my mind because it has a broader signification.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And if there was an error at that time in the address, I do not see why it should not be corrected now. With the motion of the leader of the Opposition I am heartily in accord. I am also heartily in accord with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). . . . I speak here as a Protestant, and speaking from that standpoint, I believe it is necessary in the interests of all the people in this country, irrespective of religion, creed or nationality, to come forward at this moment and assist Mr. Gladstone, and do all they can to strengthen his hands so that his statesmanlike measure may be carried into effect.

Mr. ORTON. . . . As far as my humble ability would allow me to judge, I have always held that to grant Home Rule to Ireland would be the best means of strengthening the British Empire and causing Ireland to be like what we desire Canada to be, more closely allied to the British Crown and the fortunes of the British Empire. I believe Home Rule for Ireland would have the effect of strengthening rather than weakening the British Empire. But while I hold these views, I do not consider the system of Home Rule about to be inaugurated by Mr. Gladstone is one that is calculated to strengthen the British Empire; it is not one calculated to elevate Ireland to the extent that Home Rule should elevate that country and improve its condition. In the first place, the reason why I am opposed to the resolution of the leader of the Opposition is because it endorses the Home Rule principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone.

An hon. MEMBER. No, it does not.

Mr. ORTON. I say that it is not calculated to do good to Ireland. . . . I would like to see extended to the Protestant minority in Ireland the same principles that we extend to the Catholic minority, in Ontario and the Dominion, and the same careful consideration of the minority, as is conceded to the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. But that, in my opinion, is not pro-

vided for in the measure that has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and therefore I say that I cannot support the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, because it causes this House to accede to the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule resolutions, and those principles are not the principles which I would like to see carried out. . . .

Mr. MCNEILL. I wish, however, briefly to explain what my views are on this subject, how I shall vote, and why I shall vote as I do. Before doing so, however, I should like to congratulate the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, on at last having discovered a policy. I am sorry, however, that I cannot congratulate him on the nature of the policy he has discovered. That policy is a policy of discord. The hon. gentleman knows as well as he knows that a soul is in his body, that the people of this country, the people of the Dominion of Canada, entertain views with reference to this question, as wide as the poles asunder. The hon. gentleman knows, that in his own city of Toronto, the other day a meeting was held, attended by some of the best informed and most influential men in Canada, and that at that meeting views were expressed diametrically opposed to the views that hon. gentleman presented to us to day. He knows, too, that the sentiments to which I have referred are sentiments which may very readily be stirred deeply in the breasts of the people of this country. He knows also that this question has excited such an agitation in England, as neither he nor I have seen before. He knows that England, that Great Britain and Ireland are divided into hostile camps on this subject. He knows very well that Great Britain and Ireland are in the throes of such an agitation as they have never seen before, in reference to this very question, and that an agitation so fierce is in progress there that actually the fearful and awful words "civil war" are whispered from lip to lip.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MCNEILL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he knows that.

Mr. BLAKE. No he does not.

Mr. MCNEILL. Well, if he does not, he should read the newspapers, or correspond with his friends in Ireland, and he would know it. He knows that, and he knows how deeply that question may stir up feelings of animosity among men, who are to-day neighbours and friends, and yet he has no hesitation in going out of his way to

introduce this question, and force it into the minds and hearts of the people of this country, irrespective altogether of the terrible results which may accrue. . . . But, for my part, I venture to say that I am as much entitled to speak here, on behalf of Ireland, as any man in this House. I am not only an Irishman by descent, but by birth; I spent my childhood, my boyhood, and a part of my manhood in Ireland; and I do not speak of this matter from theory, but from actual knowledge. There is not any person inside or outside this House in Canada who loves Ireland more dearly than I do. My home was there, my father and mother are buried there, and I have dear relatives and friends there to-day. I claim to have as much right to speak, on behalf of Ireland, as any man in this House or this country, whatever he may call himself, and if I thought the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone, would be for the benefit of Ireland, I would support it as heartily as anyone; BUT I DO NOT SUPPORT THE HON. GENTLEMAN'S RESOLUTION, BECAUSE IT PRACTICALLY SUPPORTS THAT MEASURE; IT PRACTICALLY AMOUNTS TO THIS, THAT IF WE PASS IT, WE SHALL BE ENDORSING MR. GLADSTONE'S ACTION.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. MCNEILL. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that if that resolution is sent over, it will simply be used by Mr. Gladstone as an argument to strengthen his position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. MCNEILL. I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen admit that. . . . Now, the measure proposed in this House in 1882 was a federal measure, which would give those people an opportunity of safe-guarding their own interests as a separate Province. The measure, the hon. gentleman is supporting, is one of a perfectly different nature. It is one which will prevent those people from having any control over their own affairs, but which will put them under the heel of the people of the other three Provinces of Ireland. . . . I shall support the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue, because it expresses this view, that we do not ask the people of England to pass any measure of Home Rule for Ireland, of any kind or description, unless that measure can be passed in such a way as to secure the unity of the Empire, and at the same time safe-guard the rights and privileges of the minority of Ireland.

MR. HACKETT. There is, of course, a very

respectable minority in Ireland opposed to Home Rule, but it is hoped and believed that this measure will afford to these people the same protection in their rights and privileges as is afforded to the minority in Quebec and to the minority in Ontario. It is a part of our Federal Government that could be very fairly put in force, and, with these amendments, I am sure that those people in the North of Ireland who are now opposed to Home Rule will be reconciled to it and will see eventually that Mr. Parnell and those sincere Protestants who work with him are patriots as well, and are working in the interests of the whole country. But, after the snub we received in sending home the address of 1882, I think it would be quite improper again to send an address of a similar character. I think we should do as they did in the Parliament of Quebec, simply pass a resolution affirming the principle of Home Rule. They are proposing to pursue a similar course in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and, in view of that fact, I support the resolution of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in amendment to the main motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I believe that resolution is more in accordance with the genius and spirit and the dignity of the people of Canada, and that, after being treated in the insolent manner in which we were treated in 1882 after the passage of that address here, and after having it sent to Her Majesty and after having received the very insolent reply from Lord Kimberly, we should not allow ourselves again perhaps to be treated in a similar way. . . .

MR. ALLEN. I desire to say a few words on this important subject before the vote is taken, being an Irishman by birth, having lived in that country for nineteen years, knowing that oppression reigns in that country, knowing and believing by past experience that that country has been badly managed, that there have been grievances for the past five hundred years, that no statesman for the past two hundred years has been able to grapple with the affairs of that country. To-day we find that there is such a gentleman who will stand up in the House of Parliament in England and advocate the rights of Ireland and the rights of Irishmen, while many in this country and in other countries deny the fact that Irishmen are competent or deserving to govern themselves. It is a slander which we do not deserve. Irishmen are able to take their position in all British dependencies in any part of the world. They are competent and able to take

a position on every platform. . . . Sir, are we afraid or ashamed to stand up for our rights and again ask Her Majesty to consider a resolution from this House? Is it true that we have been insulted? Why, Sir, we are entitled to our rights as British subjects, we are entitled to our privileges as an independent people, and I say we should stand up for the same rights which we asked for in 1882, and again give our advice to the Home Government to take into consideration the question of justice to that country which we love so much.

Mr. WALLACE (York). . . . Sir, I do not think that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will meet with the approval of this House,

BECAUSE IT ASKS THIS HOUSE TO AFFIRM THE PRINCIPLE OF MR. GLADSTONE'S BILL GIVING A MEASURE OF HOME RULE TO IRELAND.

There are many people who will favour Home Rule if it is a fair and equitable measure, but who oppose the scheme of Mr. Gladstone because of its gross injustice, and the manifest failure that will attend it if it should become law. . . . Mr. Parnell, who is at the head of the Home Rule party, is a man with great directness of purpose; he states his desires and wishes pretty plainly, and in his course he has not deviated very much from his first purpose. And what does he tell us? In a speech delivered by him at Cincinnati, on 23rd February, 1880, on the Irish question, he said:

"None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

That was the policy which Mr. Parnell in 1880 enunciated when addressing the people of Cincinnati. We find Mr. Parnell's course and policy since then have not varied. What was his policy then is evidently his policy to-day. I am afraid the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone, which is supposed to be for the better government of Ireland, will have the effect of carrying out Mr. Parnell's policy, for we find when we examine Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which we are asked by the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition to sanction and afford our moral support, indicates this.

Mr. BLAKE. If the question which is the fittest motion to be made, which is the motion that would get the greatest measure of support in this House and yet accomplish the

greatest measure of assistance for Ireland is to be solved now, on the floor of this House, by discussion between hon. members and by public expressions of opinion on the different forms proposed, that responsibility does not lie at my door, because, when I was in a position in which I was able to obtain the decision of the House upon the precise proposition which I thought moderate and yet the best calculated to produce that result, I abandoned that position upon the statement of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that, to take the other attitude and withdraw my motion and to accept the right of bringing forward my views in this form, might produce the result, after conference, of agreement: The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in inviting me to accede to the suggestion of the First Minister said:

"Therefore I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw it. Then there would be an opportunity given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who, he thinks, have been lax in their duty, to consult with him. We do not claim that anything we may say will influence his views; we do not pretend to hope that; but I think we are entitled to say to him that, feeling as much interest as he possibly can in this question, it might be possible for us to agree upon a motion that would be passed unanimously by this House. We might possibly agree upon a motion to be submitted to the House and passed unanimously, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me that such a motion would be of more value than one which necessitated a division. I am not here to discuss what changes we might ask for; that could be discussed among those specially interested, and to whom the matter might be referred. If the hon. gentleman thinks that would at all meet his views, and that we could come to such an understanding, I will not continue my remarks; but if he thinks my request is one he cannot entertain, I will have to crave the indulgence of the House while I make further remarks on this subject."

I rose and, after making an observation or two, on other things, said:

"I may at once say that I am quite willing that whatever time is reasonable and consistent with the object of the resolution should be given at once to carry out the suggestion of those hon. gentlemen. My object is just what the hon. gentleman's is, to procure a unanimous motion; and because he tells me expects, by the course he proposes, to produce such a result, I am all the more ready to agree to that course."

At a subsequent part I said:

"In the meantime, as to the form in which the motion shall be presented, I shall only be too glad to meet the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. member, with the view of settling that point."

At a subsequent period, after recess, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Whether the suggestion comes from one side of the House or the other, there are grounds, perhaps,

upon which we can unite, and the suggestion that we should agree upon a resolution is worthy of fair consideration."

"Hear, hear," said I. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say :

"And I think that the hon. gentleman who refuses that must assume considerable responsibility, if the vote is not as large as it might be made by a fair discussion of our views on the subject."

"Hear, hear," I said assentingly to that remark. Then, when the final arrangement was made, my last words were these :

"And I add to that, in response to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to the suggestion rather than the statement of the First Minister, that if there be any opportunity in the meantime to accommodate matters with reference to the form of expression of that motion, I shall be only too glad to facilitate such a result."

Then the Minister of Inland Revenue said :

"Whatever difference of opinion may exist between the hon. gentleman and myself, I feel much pleased that he has taken this course, as I think it is the wisest course and one calculated to bring about, if possible, a solution of this question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the course he has."

Now my motion was before the hon. gentleman ; he had stated his desire to consult with me ; he had stated his desire to make such suggestions as he hoped after conference might produce an agreement. I at once responded, twice and thrice responded, declaring that I would be most happy to concur in the steps he proposed to take, with a view to our arriving at that result. But the hon. gentleman, as I was obliged to say in offering my motion to-day—neither he or any other hon. gentleman intimated to me the slightest dissatisfaction with the form of my motion. They made no suggestion or proposition for a change ; they have

INVITED ME TO NO CONFERENCE

on the subject from the time the discussion closed down to this moment. Therefore, I say, if it be on the floor of this House, by the hon. gentleman bringing forward his proposition in opposition to mine, if it be on the floor of this House that we have to dispose of the question which is the fitter resolution, which is the more appropriate, the responsibility of that result, whatever may be the measure of it, lies not at my door. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue explained the reasons why he had not acted in this matter in the House ; and he took occasion to say that one of those reasons was not what had been stated erroneously in one of the papers

to be the case, a danger that the resolution would be defeated ! Not at all ; he never apprehended that ; but a danger that there would be three or four dissentients. That was what the hon. gentleman said, that was the measure of the danger which prevented him from bringing up this question in this House ! Now, Sir, we know from the proceedings which took place very shortly after the passage of the address in 1882 that there were three gentlemen who stood up and announced that they dissented on that occasion ; though neither you nor I, as I had occasion to say at that time, had seen any expression of dissent. There was therefore a public avowal of dissent on that occasion. What the hon. gentleman has now declared is, that after considering the whole situation, after analysing the feeling of the House, so far as he could judge it, and anxious as he was to go forward, after ascertaining what the feeling was, he believed that there might be three or four dissentients out of the 211 members of this House ; and that circumstance affrayed him from the enterprise. Well, we are glad to know that. In whatever quarter the hon. gentleman apprehended those three or four dissentients resided, it was not on this side, for he asked none of us our opinion on the subject ; and we have tolerably well learned already, in the course of this debate, where it was the hon. gentleman found that the dissent existed. We have heard it from the

OUTSPOKEN UTTERANCES OF SOME ;

we have heard it from the more veiled utterances of others ; we know it was in the house of the hon. gentleman's own friends ; and because there were three or four of his own supporters who disapproved of the measure he chose—and that is his defence to the people of Canada—he chose to determine that no resolution ought to be moved here. But the hon. gentleman said : There was another reason ; it is a useless thing to do in view of the circumstances of the former address, as well as a dangerous thing, because the new work could not be so thoroughly accomplished as the old. It was useless, although this was a new House ; useless, although the conditions had changed so much between that time and this ! I believe the feeling in Canada has changed ; but my belief is that there has been a growing feeling in favour of Home Rule in Canada, and that feeling is very much stronger to-day than it was in 1882 ; and certainly that is not a change which should affright

us who favour Home Rule from endeavouring to obtain the views of the representatives of the people on the subject. But there is another circumstance. The time is critical. Read the cabled reports in the newspapers of the impressions of the leading organs of public opinion and of those who take most interest in following public measures, and you find it impossible to say what the fate of the principle of Home Rule—because that is what Mr Gladstone says he holds to be at stake on the second reading of the Bill—is to be; and, Sir, if there was no reason why some further action should be taken to-day by those who acted before, I want to know why the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue telegraphed to Mr. Parnell that he and the Irish members of this House still abided by that address. He gave Mr. Parnell that encouraging and flattering assurance, that assurance so calculated to cheer and elevate his mind, that the Irish Catholic members were really still true to Home Rule! What was the inference to be drawn from that message? Why the inference was that of the other members he could not say the same. What other inference can you draw? He says to Mr. Parnell that the Irish members, by which I understand him to mean the Irish members of his own creed—nay, those of them who sit on his own side of the House—are of the same opinion as before. He treats it as an Irish Catholic question, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) treated it—

Mr. CURRAN. I beg your pardon, Sir. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and so treating it, they got together a body of gentlemen from the Senate and the House of Commons who are Irish Catholics—no, not the Irish Catholics, but the Tory Irish Catholics. Did the hon. gentleman invite Senator Power to that meeting? Did he invite Senator Scott? Were they there? Did they take part in it? No; the Irish Tory Catholic clique meet together in a little assembly, and they say this is so purely an Irish Catholic question, and a Tory Irish Catholic question, that we alone are to decide whether a resolution is safe, or prudent, or advantageous to be introduced into the House. Sir, if there be a step which is calculated to prejudice the cause of Home Rule at home or abroad, so far as we can do it, it is this treatment of it by hon. gentlemen in the hon. member's position as an Irish Catholic question—as if it was not a general question

in which all lovers of liberty throughout the world have an equal interest.

Mr. HESSON. Where are the Irish Catholics on your side?

Mr. BLAKE. I have mentioned two Irish Catholics on my side of politics, members of Parliament, whom the hon. gentleman did not consult.

Mr. HESSON. Not members of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say members of this House; I said members of Parliament. Now, Sir, I ask what inference must be drawn from the state of things to which I have referred. In 1882, an address passed unanimously by the Commons of Canada in favor of Home Rule. In 1886, the question being in a critical condition, in which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue feels it necessary that something should be said on behalf of some portion of the Commons of Canada on the subject, to show that they are still true to the views they formerly expressed, he despatches his utterance on behalf of the Irish members of the Parliament of Canada. Now, here is the contrast that would be drawn. The enemies of the cause would say: Oh, in 1882, the Canadian Parliament, unanimously in the Commons and by a very large majority in the Senate, passed resolutions in favour of Home Rule. In 1886, a Minister of the Crown, the same Irish Catholic who moved before, is afraid to move a resolution in favour of Home Rule, and he sends forward, forthwith, his own cable despatch to Mr Parnell, which is to be taken as equivalent to the voice of the Commons of Canada. No, it

COULD NOT BE EQUIVALENT.

Is it a substitute? No, but it is a declaration by inference, that the other members of this House, beyond those for whom the hon. gentleman, by what authority I do not pretend to say, chose to speak, would not say what he said. I ask, did he apply to any of them to allow him to speak for a larger constituency than those for whom he assumed to speak? If he did, what answer did he get which discouraged him from speaking for more? That is the position in which the hon. gentleman's action put the question, so that the enemies of Home Rule could say: Canada will no longer speak in favour of that measure, and the best proof of that is, that the Minister who moved the resolution in 1882, does not move another resolution to-day, and does not profess to aver that the Canadian Parliament believes as it did then. Now we know the reason.

The hon. gentleman stated it would be a dangerous thing to move again, because there would be some dissent, although he limits the dissentients to three or four. Again, the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, then, there is the difficulty about the form of another address which deterred me;" but still that does not appear to have been a very serious difficulty,

BECAUSE THE HON. GENTLEMAN HAS FOUND

another form which gets rid of that difficulty to-night, so that that could not have prevented him from earlier action unless his wit has been spurred by the exigencies of the last day or two, and his zeal for the Irish cause was not sufficiently potent to enable him to find out what, under the pressure of necessity, which we all know is a powerful lever, he has since ascertained. He has proposed a method, he says, of getting over the difficulty. But circumstances now differ. We are not, under my motion, now doing what Lord Kimberley, unadvisedly, in my opinion, told us in effect we ought not to do; we are not now tendering advice to Her Majesty's Ministers as to the policy they ought to accomplish; but we propose to cheer and encourage them on in the course they have declared they will pursue. We are not offering advice, but we are adding the moral force and support of this House to them, to aid them in the course they are themselves pursuing.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I hope it won't.

Mr. BLAKE. Ah! there is one of the dissentients.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have always been one.

Mr. BLAKE. I will have to settle an account presently with these three or four who have deterred the Minister of Inland Revenue, up to this day, from bringing forward his resolution. I say we were right, in 1882, in averring that the Commons of Canada had the right, and that it is our duty respectfully to address our Queen, the Queen of the Empire, tendering our loyal suggestions and opinions upon this question so interesting and important to us, as citizens of the Empire and as Canadians. I hope no hon. member of this House will declare to-day that we were not right in doing that, because, forsooth, a Colonial Secretary has been found to express a different opinion; I hope we are not going to abnegate that right as citizens of the Empire; I hope we are not going to derogate from that right as citizens of the Empire. I say our most dignified

course is to pass on, and to speak again when the occasion again arises, as it is now arising, in which, not under similar circumstances, because, as I have said, we are not now tendering advice but are still expressing an opinion wherein we are fortunately able to say we abide by the views we expressed in 1882, which you did not think fit to adopt then but have since adopted and are now carrying out. I say

NO MORE FORTUNATE OCCASION

could be conjectured for this country to re-assert with dignity its right to address the Queen on this important subject, with the certainty that the right this time will not be repudiated but be gratefully acknowledged. The most dignified course for us is to re-assert in that way, not by any reference to Earl Kimberley, our right to speak to our Queen, to signify to her our views on this question, the occasion, as it is now admitted, calling for it. The hon. gentleman himself proposes that we should signify our opinions, although in an abortive fashion; and proposing that we should signify our opinions, I say the most dignified and happiest method is simply to go forward and once again, in a constitutional manner—unless we are prepared to rescind our address, unless we are prepared to agree that we should do so no more—re-assert our sentiments, with such variations as the circumstances of the case may require. But if we do not choose to proceed by an address on this particular occasion—and that because we have been told formerly that we ought not proceed by address to advise or suggest—I hope that we shall not fall so low as formally to record on our journals the agreement that we ought not to act for that reason. If the hon. gentleman's amendment is passed, we shall agree that, because Earl Kimberley chose to make this statement four years ago, therefore we do not choose to address the Crown; and that of course will apply to all cases of emergencies in which Imperial interests may be concerned. We shall be agreeing and in a formal manner assenting to the view of Earl Kimberley; we shall be acting upon that view, we shall be declaring he is right and we are wrong, and in thus agreeing we will close the door upon ourselves by our own resolution, from, at any future time, venturing a humble address to the Queen upon an Imperial question. Sir, there are, no doubt, exciting times ahead for the British Empire; there may be troublous,

dangerous times ahead for the British Empire, and I shall

NEVER WILLINGLY AGREE TO ABANDON

the right of a British subject, or of the House of Commons of any colony, to approach the Queen and to tender her respectfully the advice and opinions of her subjects in foreign parts upon those questions which touch the interests of the Empire, which so nearly concern ourselves, although we are not able to speak directly by representation in the British House of Commons. I now turn to the substance of the hon. gentleman's resolution. It is a suspicious circumstance, it is a circumstance which ought to make the hon. gentleman himself suspicious of his resolution, that it finds so much favour with the enemies of Home Rule. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) with that frankness which commends itself so much to the confidence of this House, told us in the concluding, the most pungent, and, he will allow me to say, the most forcible phrase of his speech, that he would vote for the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue because it would do the least harm. Let me make an appropriate alteration in that phrase, if we are to put it in the mouth of the friends of Home Rule; and we would say: We would vote for either of the two other resolutions because they would do more good to the cause than the resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), is loyal to his party, and so he proposes to vote for the resolution of a Minister of the Government he follows, which resolution he does not approve. It is a harmful resolution, but even that one, colourless as it is, pallid as it is, hedged around as it is, built up as it is to satisfy, as far as possible, the susceptibilities of the hon. member for Muskoka, he is prepared to take, but to take only because it does the least harm of the three. The hon. gentleman has presented to him three different kinds of nauseous drugs of which he must take one. He smells at them, he sips them a little, he sets them up between him and the light, he puts down two rejected as the worst, and with a wry face he swallows the third. If these are the

SENTIMENTS OF THE ENEMIES OF HOME RULE

held as to these different resolutions, what should be the sentiments of the friends of Home Rule? I am very sorry for the cause of Home Rule that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in his attempt to please the three

or four dissentients, in the attempt not to wound their susceptibilities, should have proposed a resolution which, by comparison, will be certainly less favourable than I should have desired, which will provoke unfavourable comparisons just where we want favourable comparisons to be put. I am very sorry that, in the attempt to combine the heterogeneous elements of which the hon. gentleman's following is composed, he should have given us a resolution which has produced these comments from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and practically, though in more veiled language, from other hon. members of his way of thinking. Now the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), after having made a speech which I do not think really very likely to conduce to harmony and good feeling—perhaps it was the hon. gentleman's mode of producing harmony; perhaps, an Irishman like myself, he thinks a good fight is the way to promote harmony and good feeling—uttered a fervent expression of trust that the proceedings might end harmoniously. After all our heads are broken, I suppose we are all to shake hands. And the hon. gentleman proceeded to apply his blackthorn to my unlucky pate, and to smash me as hard as he could. Well, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman's arm is not quite long enough to reach me, and that I do not feel the worse for the exhibition of prowess which he displayed on this occasion. He says that there are grounds for suspecting me. He will not suspect me; oh no, not he; but it makes a great draft on what he calls his credulity not to suspect me; and he proceeds, with the precision of a criminal lawyer trying to make out a case in a police court, to give the grounds upon which I am to be suspected, which grounds are not sufficient, with his candour and kindness and good feeling, to induce him actually to suspect me; but it is about as hard for the hon. gentleman not to suspect me as it is for the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to swallow the resolution. He says the first ground is this: There were other Irishmen in the House, and did I consult them? Now, for a long time these hon. gentlemen, having their little clique together, got talking over this matter, trying to decide what should be done. I ask, did they consult me? Had I not helped them before? Had I not done my best to forward the cause? Had I not done my best to produce a happy result on the former occasion? And, if there was a question to be considered on this occasion,

might I not fairly have expected that before they reached a decision upon it they would have consulted me? I do not complain of their not consulting me unless they chose. I do not take the line of the hon. member for Montreal, but if it is a ground of complaint against me that I did not consult them after they had decided that it was too dangerous to move in the matter—though where the bombshells are to come from they know, not I; where the mines are to be exploded they know, not I; where the danger lies they know, not I—I should like to know with what reason they can complain of my not consulting them. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was good enough to consult me on a former occasion, in a sense. He referred to it, though with an inaccurate recollection of the circumstances, the other night. He did not invite me to his committee. I suppose it is to be pardoned to him as to me, the making of these little slips, but he gave a new nationality to one hon. member. He said they had decided to bring all the Irishmen in the House to the committee except the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. I know that “seven cities claim” the First Minister’s birthplace. Sometimes we hear that he was born in Scotland, and sometimes in Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment, I will say that he is correct in regard to what I stated. I remember that I committed that error in the words I used. What I intended to say was that we did not think it advisable at that time to invite any of the leaders of the House, and he being the leader of the Opposition was the reason why he was not invited.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman, with his superabundant loyalty to his chief, which he has exhibited on several occasions and notably on one occasion, in order to keep up that harmony on which he lays so much stress, was desirous to strengthen the First Minister’s hold on the people of this country by declaring him an Irishman for the occasion, but he now tells me that it was one of those blunders that he and I as Irishmen are privileged to make. I say the hon. gentleman was good enough, in 1882, after having settled the form of this motion, to send it to me with a note to which I responded in general terms, but in the altered motion which the hon. gentleman afterwards brought forward I saw another hand. He knows who drew it. It was his brother Irishman, the First Minister. It is quite

true he did not consult the First Minister early, but he consulted him late. He brought him at last into his committee, and when the final blow was to be struck, when the hon. gentleman was at one bound to fix himself on the pinnacle as the representative of Irish sentiment in Canada, it was his brother Irishman, the First Minister, who helped him! This is the first reason why the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), my prosecutor here, proposes to show that there are strong grounds, which only his great sense of generosity can induce him to say are inadequate, for suspecting me—that I did not consult him. The next is, that the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply. A dreadful sin; because I followed strictly the precedent of the last occasion, when the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply; because in 1882 it was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply, and in 1886 I proposed it in the same way, because the First Minister, when in Opposition, in 1878, had brought up the constitutional question of the Letellier case on amendment to the motion for supply, not at all impugning the Government at the time, but simply bringing up the question whether Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had acted constitutionally in dismissing his Ministers, brought it up as a non-party question and stated so distinctly; because I thought these two precedents were ample justification, and served as a good reason for me to propose this resolution in amendment to Committee of Supply—particularly as there was no other way of getting at it at all; because I knew that hon. gentlemen

THOUGHT IT WAS TOO DANGEROUS TO TOUCH,

and of course would not help me to touch it; that they thought it ought not to be brought up, and of course would not give me facilities for bringing it up; and therefore, but for bringing it up in that way, we would not have had it at all—because I did not perform impossibilities, only his great sense of generosity can lead him to consider the reasons inadequate for not suspecting me. Then he says that perhaps I ought not to have spoken to him, but at any rate I ought to have spoken to the Minister of Public Works, the leader of the French Conservative party, it was my business to have spoken to him, and because I did not the hon. gentleman feels grievously inclined, but for that superabundant good nature of his, to suspect me. Well, I have often had occa-

sion to consult the Minister of Public Works, during the unfortunate absence of the First Minister, on the ordinary routine of public business and so forth, and our relations are always, I am happy to say, very pleasant; but what particular reason there was for consulting with the Minister of Public Works on this question I do not know. I suppose that the decision of the Minister of Inland Revenue and his friends was not taken without consulting with his colleagues and the Minister of Public Works. We know that all these gentlemen had decided that it was too dangerous to bring this question up. Well, then, the hon. gentleman says: Oh, but the *Globe* said some time ago—I do not know when—the *Globe* pointed out that I was in a minority, and I could not bring a resolution up; and because the *Globe* expressed an opinion, which I heard of for the first time, I must confess—for I am not so diligent a reader of my *Globe* as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) is of his—I say, because the *Globe* expressed the opinion a fortnight ago that being leader of the minority I could not bring up this resolution, the hon. gentleman finds another ground which, to less credulous persons, would be a good ground for suspecting me. Then he goes further. He says that the Ottawa correspondent of the *Montreal Post* said that such a resolution, if moved here by the Conservatives, would be a Tory dodge, and because the Ottawa correspondent of the *Montreal Post*—I have no doubt a very respectable gentleman, but one whose acquaintance I have not the honour of having—said that a resolution moved by the Tories in this House upon this question would be a Tory dodge, therefore I am to be suspected if anybody but the hon. member for Montreal Centre brings up the resolution! Well, under these circumstances it is that I am a suspected character, and that I presume, under the old coercion Act, I would have been liable to be sent to Kilmainham! Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that there should be no address, that it is

CONTRARY TO THE FEELINGS OF THE IRISH
PEOPLE

—by which, I presume, he meant the Irish Catholic people—that we should address the Crown again upon this subject. I think the hon. gentleman mistook the feeling of the Irish people, whether Catholic or Protestant, I do not believe it. I think he is entirely mistaken. I should be very sorry to suppose that there is any reluctance on

their part to the Commons of Canada submitting to the Queen of the Empire their opinions on this subject; and all I can say about that is that he and I are at issue there. The hon. gentleman states that he consulted a great many persons—of course on his side of the House; and he was told there would be a very great difficulty indeed in proceeding because of the answer to the last address—very great difficulty. I dare say that the friends of the hon. gentleman who don't want Home Rule did magnify the difficulties, and pointed out to him that the snub, as it is called, of Earl Kimberley, was a reason why this great step, in which he and I are so much interested, should not be taken by the Commons. Allow me to advise the hon. gentleman in the future, when he is trying to find out whether there are difficulties, rather to distrust the opinion of those who don't want the step to be taken. You know of the timorous man who generally finds a lion in his path. The hon. gentleman has found a good many lions in his path. I do not know whether they are coloured, orange, tawny, or what, but to my mind it looks very like—for I do not share the hon. gentleman's too generous feelings in a desire not to suspect—it looks uncommonly to my mind, considering the quarters in which he searched, as if he was in search of lions, as if he wanted some good cause to be afraid, as if he wanted to find a reason for not doing anything; and he went about among the alarmists, and the alarmists alarmed him, and, being properly alarmed, he held his tongue. Then he says, the address may be regarded as a satire upon Earl Kimberley. Earl Kimberley is a very respectable and able personage, and I am sure he would have too much good sense to suppose that it was a satire upon him. But those hon. gentlemen who think that we have been snubbed by Earl Kimberley's answer, I suppose, would not be very loath to reassert our rights and our dignity by addressing the Throne, even if it did happen to be a little satirical upon Earl Kimberley. I suppose it would not grieve their souls very much that we should be able to say: We were right then, and we saw a little further into the future than you did, and we now help you on to do that thing which, four years ago, we exhorted you to do. I do not think the hon. gentleman's pack of alarmists would, from that point of view, have great difficulty in supporting the address. Well, then, there were some other hon. gentlemen who referred to me—for,

really, I have had so much attention paid to me to-night that I feel embarrassed properly to respond to the compliments I have received—there were some other hon. members to some of whose remarks I shall not pay any attention, but to one or two I shall. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr Burns) said that I had said that I had acted spontaneously. Was I not asked to move? he said; was I not forced forward? Sir, I have frankly stated that

I WAITED UNTIL THE LAST MOMENT

in the hope that some of the opposite side of the House would move. I felt satisfied that their apprehensions could not be due to my side, that they could not fear any opposition from me, knowing what I had done in 1882, and I hoped that they would be able so to compose the differences in their own ranks, so to create a unity of feeling on their side of the House, that, knowing that the solid Liberal force would be with them, they would not be afraid of their own friends, so far afraid of their own friends as not to propose a resolution. I hoped that happy result would ensue; I did hope we would find the Conservative party a unit with the Reform party in favour of this, and I waited until the last moment in order not in the slightest degree to embarrass the efforts which I felt sure—and I now find I was right—that the Minister of Inland Revenue and the hon. member for Montreal were making in order to achieve that happy result. It seems they failed to promote a unanimity of feeling amongst their friends, and that, therefore, they gave up the attempt. It has not until then, and until the question was, as I said the other day, almost at the door that I moved. Now, with reference to my being asked to move, I was not asked to move until after I had made up my mind that I was going to move, and when I was asked to move, I will tell the hon. gentleman the response which I made to those who asked me. I was asked by a deputation from a very respectable society here, the St. Patrick's Literary Society of Ottawa, and I told the gentlemen who were good enough to wait on me that, highly as I felt the honour of the invitation, I could not accept any invitation, from any body, speaking for any particular sect, or class, or nationality in this community, either to act or abstain from acting, upon a question of this description. I said I believed that the question itself would be injured if it were treated from any such point of view, as the special property of one por-

tion of the community. I said that it was as Canadians, as persons interested, from their experience of its blessings, in the principle of

HOME RULE AND ITS EXTENSION,

as Canadians, citizens and subjects of the Empire, interested in the prosperity of England, as free men, interested in the propagation of the cause of freedom, that we should act, and that I thought the strength and force of any such movement would be greatly diminished, and that prejudices would be excited which ought not to be excited, if it were attempted to be moved from one particular section of the population, or by any man as the exponent of one portion of the population. I decline altogether to agree to the position which some hon. gentlemen opposite arrogate to themselves in regard to this question. The Irish Catholic members in this House and in the other Chamber, and particularly the Tory Irish Catholic members, have no special part in this question—none whatever, and their cause suffers when they attempt to assume such a position. It is as Canadians they are to speak; it is as one whole body; with the exception of three or four individuals who have frightened the Minister of Inland Revenue, it is as Canadians speaking in favour of a common cause, moved by a common impulse and acting on a common principle, that we are to succeed, and they who make difficulties for the cause are they who declare that this question is the special part and property of a particular class of the people. Then the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) said that I was trying to catch the Irish vote. I have been in public life a good many years. The Irish population of my Province is, of course, composed of the Irish Protestant population and the Irish Catholic population.

I HAVE ENDEAVOURED TO DO MY DUTY

and to act upon what I believe were sound liberal principles towards all classes of the population. I have found myself opposed by a solid body, by the great majority, by the vast bulk of the Irish Protestants of Ontario. They are my strongest, and sternest, and fiercest political opponents to-day. I have found myself opposed by the great bulk of the Irish Catholics of Ontario. They also, with some noble exceptions, were amongst my opponents when I was defeated in South Bruce, during my absence from the country through ill-health. It was the Irish Catholics of that riding that rejected me, that deprived

me of my seat in Parliament and obliged me to stand for another constituency at a subsequent date. I have endeavoured, notwithstanding all that, to do my duty and to act according to my lights honestly, justly and fairly towards the Irish Catholics and towards the Irish Protestants, towards all classes. I make no distinction whatever in consequence of class or creed, and I extend no bid for the support of any class or creed. The position of the Irish Catholics and the Irish Protestants is this: They know that from the Liberal party they will obtain all they can justly claim, whether they give or refuse their support to that party. They know that the Liberal party will always act on the principle of justice, freedom and equal rights, because that is the plank upon which we stand. They know they have nothing whatever to gain by supporting us, because they will not gain one jot or tittle beyond what those principles of justice, freedom and equal rights require. They know they have nothing to lose by opposing us, because they know, however strenuous their opposition may be,

IT WILL NOT MAKE US ONE WHIT LESS EARNEST

or less active in the promotion of their interests and of the common interests according to the same principles of justice, liberty and equal rights. And therefore there is no need for them to turn their votes one way or the other in order that they may obtain from the Liberal party their need of justice and liberty. That is our relation to that class, as to which the hon. gentleman rather coarsely said I was attempting to catch their votes. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is an old personal friend of mine, and who I am sure must have been very much excited to-night when he raised his blackthorn against me, as did the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), used some expressions in regard to a former debate, for which he was called to order and to which I will not refer. He said later that I occupied a very peculiar position because I happened to be—he mis-stated my position—the leader of a party in religion. I am none such. I am certainly of the evangelical portion of the denomination to which I belong, and I am a member of the advanced wing, perhaps, of that party. That is quite true. And the hon. gentleman says because I am a Protestant, occupying that position I must know, if I have any Protestant friends in Ireland, that every Protestant in Ireland denounces Mr. Gladstone's measure, and that I am inconsistent in my present course. I

have some Protestant friends in Ireland and I have some in Canada, and the bulk of my Protestant friends in Ireland, and, though I regret it, it is perfectly natural considering their condition, circumstances and surroundings, are opposed to Home Rule.

BUT I DENY ALTOGETHER THE STATEMENT

that every Protestant in Ireland denounces Home Rule. It is not so. The hon. gentleman will find that there are a very considerable number of Protestants who are for self-government for Ireland. And it is not to be forgotten that such was the sentiment of the country at the very time at which that union took place, which is now thought such a sacred compact—that compact which was begotten in profligacy and corruption admittedly without a parallel, that compact which was certainly not a holy compact—it was opposed as strongly and earnestly by a large body of Protestants, aye by Orangemen too, as by the other classes of the population. Then the hon. gentleman from Muskoka said—and I quite approve of his observation, and I made one like it myself—that he claimed the right to speak for Ireland as well as the Minister of Inland Revenue. He is perfectly right. I quite accord the right to speak for Ireland to the hon. member for Muskoka; let each speak according to his lights. He thinks Home Rule will be disadvantageous to the country from which his people came, and I think it is an advantageous proposal for the country from which my people came. We are each of us I suppose entitled to our own views and are free to follow our own convictions. I quite agree that the hon. gentleman has a right to speak for Ireland as any other hon. member whose ancestors came from Ireland, but in each case it must depend upon the circumstances under which, and the degree of interest and thoroughness with which the hon. gentleman has studied the question, and after all any definite conclusion at which any of us may arrive may be erroneous. The member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) said he also had something to say about it. He endorsed the principle of Home Rule, but he found words to say that he would support the Ministry. I do not think it takes very much to induce the member for Centre Wellington to support the Administration. I pass him by. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that I knew there was a great diversity of opinion in Ontario. I have no doubt there is a considerable number of persons absolutely, though a very small number relatively, I be-

lieve, in the Province who entertain strong opinions adverse to Home Rule;

BUT I BELIEVE THAT THE VAST MAJORITY

of the people of that Province, taken as a whole, are directly, thoroughly and irrevocably in favour of the principles of Home Rule as applied to Ireland. That is my opinion; I may be mistaken; the member for North Bruce may be right if he entertains a different opinion, but such at all events is my opinion. Then the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that the motion would not do because it endorses the measure of Mr. Gladstone. What my motion does is to endorse the principle of that measure, which principle, as I pointed out to the House on Tuesday, the author of the Bill himself declares to be the principle of Local Government or autonomy for Ireland. The question of Irish representation for Imperial purposes at Westminster, Mr. Gladstone said: I put to one side, I do not ask you to vote for that on the second reading. There are other details in regard to internal matters, and in regard to them Mr. Gladstone says: I do not ask you to vote for them, but I ask you in voting for the second reading of the Bill to vote for the principle of self-government for Ireland and for this measure as calculated, at all events as far as the Local Government of Ireland is concerned, irrespective of the question of the measure of control Ireland should have in Imperial affairs and of some other questions, to form a basis for settlement. What the hon. gentleman from West York says is that the measure will not do. It does not suit his views. He is opposed to any large measure of Home Rule. He would like the Irish to have municipal institutions, but a large measure of Home Rule he is opposed to, and therefore he is opposed to my motion. That is

THE VERY REASON I WANT MY MOTION CARRIED,

because I am in favour of a large measure of Home Rule. He is opposed to my measure because it will aid, comfort and support the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which he does not want to take place. But that is just what I do want—that the second reading of that Bill should be carried. I believe that the most important stage in the question of Home Rule for Ireland would be achieved by the second reading of that Bill. I do not believe the question will be ultimately settled in the terms of that Bill, but the most important stage in the settlement of it will have been passed if it is carried, and

if it fails I do not choose to forecast the consequences. But I do say that the very reason which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who, with those other gentlemen, are, I suppose, the dissentients, to whom the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue referred—the very reason he and others give as a ground why the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is preferable to the motion which I have offered—that they are prepared to support it, because it would do so little good to the cause of Home Rule and that it would do less harm to the opposition to Home Rule than the other, is the reason why my motion should receive the support of the House. Then the hon. gentleman says the question is a most intricate one. Undoubtedly, it is a vast question, an enormously intricate question in its details; and if we were offering an opinion on all its details I think we would require a great deal more study and perhaps a great deal more local knowledge, as to some of them, than we have had the opportunity of acquiring. But we are not asked to pronounce on the details of the measure. We are asked, as I have said and I have established, to pronounce on the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as

**AN AFFIRMATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF
HOME RULE TO IRELAND.**

That is the best, the most sensible, the most practical step towards the accomplishment of the object which I believe a majority of this House has at heart, and that step we are asked not to take, that step we are asked to set aside in favour of this pale, this colourless resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue, which is acceptable to hon. gentlemen who do not like Home Rule because it is the least calculated to promote Home Rule! The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said it really looked to him as if I were toadying to Mr. Gladstone. Because I had not moved an address directly to Mr. Gladstone, because I had not asked the House to express its sympathy and admiration for Mr. Gladstone, as has been done by other bodies, because I preferred passing him by and moving for an address to our Most Gracious Sovereign, I am supposed, forsooth, to be toadying to Mr. Gladstone! When in 1882 I ventured to point out the difficulties of Mr. Gladstone's attitude at that time, when I pointed out what he has since proved true by his action, that it was not a sufficient defence for him to say that a small minority which had grievances did not formulate a plan which they had no power to carry into

effect; that if he admitted that there existed grievances, it was his duty, who had the power, to formulate the best plan he could in order to remedy admitted grievances according to his lights, the First Minister said: Here is a gentleman criticising that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, criticising him adversely, using harsh language towards him, telling him that he is mistaken, that he is wrong, that he ought to do some other thing; Mr. Gladstone, he said, though a great statesman, like other men, is human, and he will be annoyed when he sees the hon. gentleman's speech; I hope, he said, that the report containing the speech will be delayed in transmission; I hope that by some happy accident the mail steamer may be lost, so that the hon. gentleman's speech may not reach him, because, if it does, the good which the address will do will be defeated by what he said of Mr. Gladstone! Yet the hon. member for West York finds to-day that I am toadying to Mr. Gladstone! Now, Sir, I believe it is extremely unfortunate that the proposals of the Minister of Inland Revenue as to an effort to agree upon the motion, in the interval between Tuesday and to-day, were not by him carried out. I think it would have been much better if that had been done; but we have now to settle the question in the ordinary way. I consider my motion preferable to the hon. gentleman's for the reasons I have stated. I consider the amendment which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is proposing to introduce in it an improvement on my motion. I intend, therefore, to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington.

MR. THOMPSON. Now, a reason given why the House should adopt this resolution is that it is the right of the House, in spite of the rebuke of the Earl of Kimberley to assert its undoubted privilege of addressing the Throne. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this has been altogether renounced in the resolution now offered to this House and in the speech of the hon. member for West Durham. That resolution and that speech assert no right. They simply express joy at the action of Mr. Gladstone in introducing the Home Rule measure; and the hon. member for West Durham says: We are not approaching the Throne as we did before, we are not tendering advice to Her Majesty, or Her Majesty's advisors; we are cheering them on. Sir, the House in 1882, on motion of my friend the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue did cheer on a depressed, a downcast cause; and I

humbly think it is beneath the dignity of this House, as I feel sure it is beneath the dignity of gentlemen expressing such a large love of liberty, to say that this action is taken only to cheer on the Imperial Government, sustained by a powerful Parliament, in bringing forward a measure which has obtained so thorough an adhesion, and the success of which is really assured, if not as to its details, at any rate as to a very large measure of the principle involved. . . .

I agree in the statement of the hon. member for West Durham, that we have the right to express our opinion, as fellow-subjects of the Empire, on that or any other question; but I do say that before this House is asked to sacrifice its dignity by approaching again the very men who have declared they have no advice to take from us, that the matter is exclusively one for themselves to consider, and that they had formed their opinion before hearing from us, at least it should be shown that some practical useful purpose is to be served and somebody to be benefitted. It is for these reasons that I am in sympathy entirely with the Minister of Inland Revenue, in feeling indisposed to invite the action of Parliament upon that question again this Session. . . I do say, both as one who is entirely in sympathy with the address of 1882, and as a member of this House, that I am opposed to passing any address on this subject in view of all these circumstances, and that I think the dignity and self-respect of this House will be best maintained by simply asserting what this House resolved in 1882 it adheres to to-night, and records its opinion without undertaking to present an address on the subject to the man who spurned our address before, from whom we have no reason to expect any change in this particular, although there may be a change in the question now before Parliament. . . .

MR. COURSOL. I think it is the opinion of all the Irishmen in Canada that something should be done here, and I believe they will be thankful to the mover of the resolution. This is no time to quarrel about politics. This is no time to say that it has been brought in by the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition. It is for us to decide whether the proposition before us deserves our approval, whether it will serve the purpose desired, whether it will show to England, to the British Empire, that Mr. Gladstone, in his Home Rule measure, has friends in Canada who are disposed to cheer him on in the course he has adopted. . . . We are told that Mr. Gladstone held different

views some time ago. I do not care what views he may have held in the past ; I care for his views of to-day. I take his proposition as I find it, and I think it deserves our hearty support. I believe the day is not far distant when he will achieve that great feat of repairing the injustices of the past, that he will receive the reward he deserves, and that his brilliant career will be closed by passing a law that will be a blessing to the people who have suffered so long. For my part, I do not view this as a party measure. If the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue had been alone before the House, I would gladly have supported it. But if I find something more to the point, something calculated to do more good, I am bound, as a lover of Ireland, as a lover of freedom, to support the second proposition. . . . Now, Sir, the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is couched in a calm, dignified tone, there is nothing in it to offend, and I am sure if it is sent by this Parliament to Mr. Gladstone, he will receive it with gratitude, and thereby correct the mistake that was made before. We ought not to think of that, if we can accomplish our end ; our first object is to do good to Ireland, and we ought not to dispute about the terms, we need not be so punctilious about the terms. Let us do our duty first about the cause of Ireland and of Home Rule, and if we succeed we shall be satisfied. If, on the contrary, the English Government should think fit to return such an answer as they did before, then Canada will know what she will have to do, but I presume no such thing will happen. I shall vote in favour of the amendment as it stands, hoping that it will be annexed to the motion of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say but a few words on the subject that has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon and evening. I have waited until our Irish friends in the House have had an opportunity of expressing their views, and now that they have had full opportunity, and one of our French friends has found occasion to approve of the course of the leader of the Opposition and of the resolution which he has submitted, I, who cannot claim to be either Irish by birth or Irish by descent, recognize that fact, and at the same time venture to claim that I am in a position in which I may be permitted to say a few words on this question. I conceive this to be a question that is more than an Irish question. These resolutions are introduced into the Canadian Parliament, and as a Canadian,

and as a representative in the Canadian Parliament, I feel I am at liberty to express my views in regard to the substance of them, and to intimate what my views are in that direction. I think it is eminently proper that in the Canadian Parliament, composed of the representatives of various Provinces, which enjoy to the full the privilege of local self-government, such resolutions should be introduced. I was one of those in the House who, in 1882, was very glad, along with almost all the members in the House, to ratify by my assent and by my vote on that occasion what I believed to be a correct principle, that local self-government should be given to the people of Ireland, permitting them to manage their own local affairs as to them might seem right and proper. And therefore when the leader of the Opposition has to-day placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a resolution declaring that we adhere to the principles we enunciated at that time and evidenced by our vote, and that he desires further to express to Her Majesty our belief that the principles we then advocated have been incorporated in a measure that has been brought down by the Imperial Cabinet and submitted to the House of Commons, I feel that I desire to express my approval of that resolution and give it my support, and, if I have an opportunity, my vote. It is to be regretted very much, I think, that on a question of this great consequence, on a question on which it is so desirable that we should all be united, an attempt should have been made to introduce an element of party strife. It is particularly to be regretted that the evident intention to introduce, if possible, party strife into the discussion of this question should come from those who have constituted themselves, as it were, the special champions of the Irish people and of the Irish cause.

. . . . Where is the proof of the charge laid against the leader of the Opposition that he has introduced this resolution in a purely party spirit and for party gains and purposes? The Minister of Justice charged that when the Costigan resolutions were introduced, one of which expressed the hope that persons then confined in gaol might be released, the voice of the leader of the Opposition was not raised on that occasion. Does not the hon. gentleman know that on that very occasion the leader of the Opposition seconded the motion? Does not he know, and if he was not present has he not heard that such was the case? I well recall that his eloquent advocacy of the cause of local self-government of the Irish people captivated the entire par-

liamentary assembly, and that the cheers rang out not only from his supporters but from those who were politically opposed to him. I have here the testimony, in contradiction of the charge of the Minister of Justice that the leader of the Opposition had sat silent upon that occasion. I have the testimony of the Minister of Inland Revenue himself. In his speech delivered in this House the other day he said :

" Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion, when this same subject was discussed before this Parliament, no man who sat in this Chamber and listened to the hon. gentleman when he spoke on that occasion admired him more sincerely than I did, or was more ready to congratulate him upon the very able speech he delivered on that occasion."

And yet, Sir, the Minister of Justice rose and charged when these resolutions were passing through—alluding to one of them desiring the release of the persons then in prison—the leader of the Opposition had remained silent. I tell you, Sir, and I tell the House that long before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this Parliament this measure of Home Rule for the people of Ireland was in the heart, and found expression from the lips, of the hon. leader of the Opposition. Two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this House, when my hon. friend was speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the probable immigration we would receive into our country, reciting the fact which he much regretted that we did not receive so large a number of immigrants from Ireland as he desired we might, he pointed out what he deeply regretted, that unfortunately the Irish Catholic population of Ireland, when they left their country owing to the embittered feelings which existed between Ireland and England, instead of seeking our shores where they could find comfortable homes and work their fortunes, they sought the shores of another country and became settlers of, and helpers in, building up a foreign nation. Upon that occasion the leader of the Opposition, after deploring the fact I have pointed out, said this :

" But I hope for great things for Ireland and the Empire from the events of the last few days. I hope and trust that the advent to power of the Liberal party, supported by a great majority of decided Liberals and Radicals, will result in fresh measures of relief and justice to Ireland, which will tend still further to weaken her old feelings of hostility and dissatisfaction, and to make the Empire in this regard a United Empire. I hope we shall see among other things a moderate measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and witness by the application of

that measure the creation and maintenance of true and real bonds of Union between Ireland and the rest of the so-called United Kingdom."

That was the sentiment deep in the heart of the leader of the Opposition, a sentiment which found expression from his lips two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were moved at all ; and yet, although that is the record of the hon. gentleman, he is charged by hon. gentlemen on the other side, now that the desire of his heart in that respect seems to be approaching completion, now when he sees that by another effort it may become almost an accomplished fact, they say that after having waited, after having given them every opportunity to move from the other side, in order if possible, that a unanimous vote might be secured, after waiting until he found from the newspapers that they would not move, he comes forward and moves his resolution—a resolution which is simply an affirmation of the one which was adopted by hon. gentlemen on both sides in 1882, and stating further that we desired to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognizing the principle of local self-government for Ireland—they now find fault with him for moving this resolution. . . . I would desire to express my joy that now at last there has been a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament by the Premier of the Empire to secure that boon to the Irish people ; and I am of the opinion expressed in the words of the amendment offered by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the events that have taken place since 1882 have strengthened the conviction we then entertained, that it was a proper and desirable thing to grant such a measure. I shall therefore have much pleasure in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington, which will express to Her Majesty, as we have clearly a right to do, that we hold the same views now that we held in 1882, and that we rejoice to know that those views are now embodied in a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament for ratification and approval. I shall have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting this resolution, and I only regret that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has sought to supplant the original resolution by the introduction of a resolution that will not tend in any material degree, I fear, to strengthen the hands of the right hon. gentleman engaged in this great task, but whose hands would be most materially strengthened

if the original resolution were to receive, as it ought in my opinion to receive, the approval of the members of this Chamber.

Mr. MITCHELL. . . . It is useless to argue at this age of history the question of whether the Irish people should have Home Rule or not; it is universally admitted that grievances have existed and that the peace of Ireland has suffered from the want of that power of self-government within the island itself, which is almost universally admitted to be now necessary. I will, therefore, not now discuss that side of the question, because I think there is but one opinion on all sides of this House, and that is that the action taken by the right hon. the First Minister of England, that the principle of the Bill which he submitted—I am not going so far as to say I will endorse all the details, I think there are many the right hon. gentleman knows he will require to alter—but I say the principle of the Bill is one which will be universally admitted in this House to be of absolute necessity in order to secure the peace of the Empire. . . . When we find the right hon. the first Minister of England is receiving assurances of sympathy from foreign lands, from Irishmen south of the border, and from other British colonies, it is our duty as well as our right to give expression to the wish which in our heart we feel that every effort should be made to meet the just expectations of that country which has suffered so much from maladministration. I will say no more on this point, but simply express my opinion as to what is desirable we should do to sustain the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I regret very much to find that the reasonable motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was not accepted by the Administration. Let anyone take up that resolution and let him take up the amendment moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and say whether there is any very substantial difference between the two, except this, that the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham is more explicit, more to the point, conveys better the idea we desire to convey, conveys in the strongest manner possible the desire of our people through their representatives in Parliament to press upon Her Majesty, Her Majesty's advisors, and the people of England, the fact that we in Canada, comprising between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 people, admittedly the brightest gem in the crown of England, her foremost colony, one that has shown by her enterprise that she is prepared to receive the homeless millions of Europe—sympathize

with Mr. Gladstone; and our opinion should be expressed in a manner in which there will be no uncertain sound or doubt. If the hon. member for West Durham had not moved his resolution, and the Minister of Inland Revenue had submitted his as an original proposition, I would have supported it with pleasure; but in my opinion it is not as strong as the other, because it is simply an expression of the opinion of this Parliament, while the motion of the hon. member for West Durham is a direct address to the foot of the Throne. If the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had been presented in the first instance I would have gladly supported it, and I feel that, after the unanimous expression of the opinion of this Parliament which we gave in 1882, when I had not the honour of being in Parliament, it is a matter of regret that on this occasion we should not act unanimously. If there be a division on the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, and if the House divides on the motion of the hon. member for Wellington and the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is carried, I suppose it will be carried on a divided House. That is a fact that I would very much regret. I feel that if we are sending an expression of opinion on so vital and important a question to a large number of our fellow-subjects on the other side of the water, we ought to send an unanimous expression of opinion, and I would ask the Ministry whether, even at this late hour, they could not find that it would not derogate from their dignity or influence, but, on the contrary, lead them to be more respected in this House and country, if in order to command unanimity they should withdraw the motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for West Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would then withdraw his, and the first resolution go as proposed. But if the Government are determined to press for a division, the country will hold them responsible for it. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who waited two months after the House opened before he submitted his resolution, I am sure, though I am not in his confidence, knew nothing of this motion, and would have been willing at once to accept the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue, if it had been submitted in the first instance. If, with so little difference between the two resolutions, a division is had, the country will hold the Administration of the day responsible for preventing that unanimity upon this question which we all desire.

That is all I have to say. In sending home a resolution on this subject I do not want to vote as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said he would, for a resolution that will do the least good. I want to vote for the strongest resolution, and therefore I propose to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington, and, failing that, for the motion of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. COSTIGAN. . . . I need not repeat what I have already stated, and what has been better stated by my colleague the Minister of Justice, that the contention has been a little strained, that because a new Parliament has come in, that resolution is of no force unless it is renewed by this Parliament, I say it has all that force it had on the day it was passed until some adverse resolution is adopted by the Parliament of Canada. It is true that we are not the same in *personnel*, that we are not the same Parliament, but we were the voice of Canada at that time, and the expression of the people of Canada through their representatives has never been reversed up to the present time. It may be reversed to-night. It may be, if a vote is taken, that it will be weakened, I hope I shall not be held responsible for that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You certainly will.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. gentlemen say that I certainly shall be. I am prepared to take the responsibility of any act I perform. I have always been prepared to do that. . . . I will vote against any amendment that may be proposed in order to reach my own motion. I believe that my motion will recommend itself to a majority of this House, and I think it will meet the reasonable expectations of every man who wishes to see harmony in this country, which is the subject of our discussion to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Harmony and peace on that side of the House, you mean.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, the harmony and peace we secure on this side. We do not know all the little differences that occur on that side. . . . If the day should come that it appears to the people most interested in this question that they have reason to believe I have failed in the proper discharge of my duty, I will pay the penalty of not having their confidence any longer.

[House then divided on amendment (Mr. McMullen)]:

YEAS :
Messieurs

Allen,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Auger,

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Holton,
Béchar,.	Innes,
Bergeron,	Irvine,
Bernier,	Jackson,
Blake,	King,
Bourassa,	Kirk,
Burpee,	Landerkin
Cameron (Huron),	McIntyre,
Cameron (Middlesex),	McMullen,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Mills,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mitchell,
Casey,	Mulock,
Casgrain,	Paterson (Brant),
Cook,	Platt,
Coursol,	Rav,
Davies,	Rinfret,
Desaulniers (Maskin'g),	Scrivner,
Desjardins,	Somerville (Brant),
Dupont,	Somerville (Bruce),
Fairbank,	Springer,
Fisher,	Sutherland (Oxford)
Forbes,	Trow,
Gigault,	Vail,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Glen,	Weldon,
Guay,	Wilson,
Gunn,	Wright,
Harley,	Yeo.—60.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Haggart,
Allison,	Hall,
Bain (Soulanges)	Hay,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Hesson,
Baker (Victoria),	Hickey,
Barker,	Homer,
Barnard,	Hurteau,
Beaty,	Jamieson,
Bell,	Jenkins,
Benoit,	Kaulback,
Blondeau,	Kilvert,
Bourbeau,	Kinney,
Bowell,	Kranz,
Bryson,	Labrosse,
Burnham,	Landry (Kent),
Burns,	Landry (Montmagny),
Cameron (Inverness),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Cameron (Victoria),	Lesage,
Campbell (Victoria),	Macdonald (King's),
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mackintosh,
Cimon,	Macmaster,
Cochrane,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Costigan,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Coughlin,	McCallum,
Curran,	McCarthy,
Cuthbert,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Daly,	McGreevy,
Daoust,	McLelan,
Dawson,	McNeill,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Massue,
Dickinson,	Moffat,
Dodd,	Montplaisir,
Dugas,	O'Brien,
Dundas,	Orton,
Everett,	Ouimet,
Farrow,	Paint,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Patterson (Essex),
Ferguson (Welland),	Pinsonneault,
Fortin,	Pruyn,
Foster,	Reid,
Gaudet,	Riopel,
Girouard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Gordon,	Robertson (Hastings),
Grandbois,	Royal,
Guilbault,	Rykert,
Guillet,	Scott,
Hackett,	Shakespeare,

Messieurs

Small,
 Sproule,
 Stairs,
 Taschereau,
 Tassé,
 Taylor,
 Temple,
 Thompson,
 Townshend,
 Tupper,
 Tyrwhitt,
 Valin,
 Vanasse,
 Wallace (Albert),
 Wallace (York),
 Ward,
 White (Cardwell),
 White (Hastings),
 White (Renfrew),
 Wigle,
 Wood (Brockville),
 Wood (Westmoreland)—118.

Amendment negatived.

House then divided on amendment (Mr. Costigan):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,
 Bain (Soulanges),
 Baker (Missisquoi),
 Baker (Victoria),
 Barker,
 Barnard,
 Beaty,
 Bell,
 Benoit,
 Blondeau,
 Bourbeau,
 Bowell,
 Bryson,
 Burnham,
 Burns,
 Cameron (Inverness),
 Cameron (Victoria),
 Campbell (Victoria),
 Carling,
 Caron (Sir Adolphe),
 Cimon,
 Cochrane,
 Costigan,
 Coughlin,
 Curran,
 Cuthbert,
 Daly,
 Daoust,
 Dawson,
 Desaulniers (St. Maurice),
 Dickinson,
 Dodd,
 Dugas,
 Dundas,
 Everett,
 Farrow,
 Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
 Ferguson (Welland),
 Fortin,
 Foster,
 Gaudet,
 Girouard,
 Gordon,
 Grandbois,
 Guilbault,
 Guillet,
 Hackett,
 Haggart,
 Hall,
 Hay,
 Hesson,
 Hickey,
 Hilliard,
 Homer,
 Hurteau,
 Jamieson,
 Jenkins,
 Kaibach,
 Kilvert,
 Kinney,
 Kranz,
 Labrosse,
 Landry (Kent),
 Landry (Montmagny),
 Langevin (Sir Hector),
 Lesage,
 Macdonald (King's),
 Macdonald (Sir John),
 Mackintosh,
 Macmaster,
 Macmillan (Middlesex),
 McMillan (Vandreuil),
 McCallum,
 McCarthy,
 McDougall (C. Breton),
 McGreevy,
 McLelan,
 McNeill,
 Massue,
 Moffatt,
 Montplaisir,
 O'Brien,
 Orton,
 Ouimet,
 Paint,
 Patterson (Essex),
 Pinsonneault,
 Pruyn,
 Reid,
 Riopel,
 Robertson (Hamilton),
 Robertson (Hastings),
 Royal,
 Rykert,
 Scott,
 Shakespeare,
 Small,
 Sproule,
 Stairs,
 Taschereau,
 Tassé,
 Taylor,
 Temple,
 Thompson,
 Townshend,
 Tupper,
 Tyrwhitt,
 Valin,
 Vanasse,
 Wallace (Albert),
 Wallace (York),
 Ward,
 White (Cardwell),
 White (Renfrew),
 Wigle,
 Wood (Brockville),
 Wood (Westmoreland)—117.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,
 Amyot,
 Armstrong,
 Anger,
 Bain (Wentworth),
 Béchard,
 Bergeron,
 Bernier,
 Blake,
 Bourassa,
 Burpee,
 Cameron (Huron),
 Cameron (Middlesex),
 Campbell (Renfrew),
 Cartwright (Sir Richard),
 Casey,
 Casgrain,
 Cook,
 Coursol,
 Davies,
 Desaulniers (Mask'g6),
 Desjardins,
 Dupont,
 Fairbank,
 Fisher,
 Forbes,
 Gigault,
 Gillmor,
 Glen,
 Guay,
 Gunn,
 Harley,
 Holton,
 Innes,
 Irvine,
 Jackson,
 King,
 Kirk,
 Landerkin,
 McIntyre,
 McMullen,
 Mills,
 Mitchell,
 Mulock,
 Paterson (Brant),
 Platt,
 Ray,
 Rinfret,
 Scriver,
 Somerville (Brant),
 Somerville (Bruce),
 Springer,
 Sutherland (Oxford),
 Trow,
 Vail,
 Watson,
 Weldon,
 White (Hastings),
 Wilson,
 Wright,
 Yeo.—61.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. However deeply I may regret, Sir, that the Commons of Canada should have decided to speak with a voice so vague and ineffective, and to add so slight an impulse to the movement I was hoping to advance, it is yet for me to consider what is the best use that can be made of that vague and ineffective voice and that slight impulse. The resolution we are to substitute for the original resolution is a simple expression of our opinion, to lie upon our journals. Weak and inadequate as it is, it is still better that it should do some good; and I therefore move to add to the motion, as amended, the words following:—

And that a copy of the resolution be communicated forthwith by Mr. Speaker to Mr. Gladstone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to this amendment simply on the plain ground that it is in direct contravention to the resolution we have just passed. It is in effect an address.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I object to it on another ground. I think it is unworthy of the dignity of this House that we should append to a resolution such as we have passed a message requiring you, as the Speaker of this House, to communicate it even to such a distinguished individual as Mr. Gladstone; and if by doing so, as I have no doubt my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition desires, we should give encour-

agement to his proposition for Home Rule for Ireland in the sense in which he has denounced it, I demur to it on that ground also, as totally dissenting from any such proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I support it on this ground, that inasmuch as the minority of this House, who I believe will find their action endorsed by a majority in the country, have failed to get such a resolution as would fairly express in the strongest terms our approval of Home Rule for Ireland, and secure the greatest amount of good, I believe our next duty is to put the resolution adopted by this House into such a shape that the man who stands foremost in the world to-day, and is endeavouring to give Ireland the benefit of self-government, shall have his hands strengthened in every way in which we can do it; and I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. The position the hon. First Minister has taken on this resolution shows very clearly to the House and the country what are his real feelings on this subject. It is well known that hon. gentlemen opposite are not sincere advocates of the principles of Home Rule. It is well known that the hon. leader of the Government has again and again declared himself against the principle of federation, against the principle of local self-government, and in favour of a legislative union. But the hon. gentlemen have not the courage of their convictions. While they profess to favour Home Rule, they propose a resolution that is addressed to nobody. Now, Sir, when my hon. friend proposes that that resolution should be sent to the Prime Minister of England, who is struggling with the aristocratic classes there to maintain the rights of the people of Ireland, then these hon. gentlemen say: We shall not consent that that resolution shall be sent to Mr. Gladstone; we shall not consent that it shall be put into the hands of the man who is seeking to confer that benefit on the people of Ireland; but we will leave it on the journals of our House; if the Irish people of Canada attack us we will say, we voted in favour of this resolution; and if our Orange friends are disposed to attack us for voting for Home Rule, we will say, it is true, we attempted to conciliate a section of our followers by voting for that resolution, but we refused to forward it to Mr. Gladstone, because we did not intend that it should be of the slightest service to the people of Ireland.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I crave the attention of

this House for a few moments. I beg to propose a resolution, and I ask the followers of Sir John A. Macdonald to back me up:

That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Parnell.

The Irish people to-day owe this movement to Mr. Parnell. We would not be here to-night voting for this resolution if it had not been for the noble exertions of that noble man. If any credit is due to any person for the position of the question to-day, it is due to Mr. Parnell; and I ask my hon. friends on this side of the House to back me on this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved by Mr. Coughlin to strike out the word "Gladstone" and insert the word "Parnell."

Mr. BLAKE. I should have been very glad if the hon. gentleman had proposed to add the words "and Mr. Parnell" to the words of the resolution; and I should have cordially acceded to that, recognising as I do the great services that Mr. Parnell has rendered to the cause of Home Rule. But at this moment I think it is the hands of Mr. Gladstone that want strengthening, and I am not going to vote to strike out the name of Mr. Gladstone in order to substitute that of Mr. Parnell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is well that the First Minister, at any rate, has thrown off the mask, and has shown us clearly and distinctly, what all of us who know him know, that he has no sympathy for Ireland, and no more sympathy for Home Rule in Ireland than he has for Home Rule in Canada. The hon. gentleman has been plotting, since the time he was sworn in as First Minister of Canada, against the Local Governments of this country. We know, Sir, that but for Sir George Cartier, when he was sent to England as a delegate some nineteen years ago, he would have misused and abused the power put into his hands to deprive us of our local liberties, and, Sir, now thrown off his guard for a moment, he cannot help showing his real sentiments. He cannot help showing as far as lies in him that even this emasculated and miserable resolution, which the Minister of Inland Revenue I regret to say, has allowed himself to be made a tool of to have placed on our journals—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not use that word.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, if you rule that to say that one Minister is the

tool of another is out of order, I will withdraw that in deference to your ruling. I maintain my own opinion as to the use that has been made of the hon. gentleman by the First Minister on this particular occasion, as before. Sir, the hon. gentleman's resolution, I do not doubt in the least from the verbiage of it, has been conceived in the brain, if not traced by the hand of the First Minister; and Sir, if there could be a more contemptible, a more ridiculous, a more absurd proposition placed before this House, after formally passing a resolution—which if it has any meaning or object, if there is any conceivable sense in it, must be intended for the purpose of strengthening Mr. Gladstone in the struggle against great odds that he is now maintaining for the bestowal of Home Rule upon Ireland—it is the refusal to adopt the sensible and intelligent proposition of my hon. friend beside me, that that resolution should be sent to Mr. Gladstone. What position shall we be in—what attitude shall we assume—if it turns out that we are bold enough to pass a resolution here, but are not bold enough to send it where alone it would be of use—that we have dared to put it on our journals, but do not dare to communicate it to the Imperial House? For my own part, I say that we, as British subjects, have got a good right to advise the Empire on all points of Imperial policy such as this. There are greater issues contained in this question than the mere question of Home Rule for Ireland. From this will spring other results. I believe that one result which will spring from this will be that in substance, within a few years, the English people will have to adopt a system somewhat similar to that which we have here; because I believe that this doctrine of Home Rule cannot be applied to Ireland alone, that, in all human probability, is comprised in it a Federate Parliament for the British Isles, and probably for the British Empire. It may be something more than that; it may be an alliance, if not a federation, of the whole British race, and it is because I believe it is the interest of the whole British Empire and British race depends to a large extent of doing away with those just causes of complaint which the Irish people have long had, that I am prepared to support my hon. friend's motion. But in any case let us not commit the miserable absurdity of putting a resolution on our journals and yet not daring to communicate it to the Imperial Government.

Mr. McNEILL. There is no question of daring in the matter.

* * * * *

Mr. CURRAN. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Middlesex. I hear, on the other side of the House, a great many jeering remarks, but I want to say that, for my part, I look upon the sturdy perseverance with which Mr. Parnell has conducted his campaign, as being the cause of bringing Mr. Gladstone to the position he occupies, and if we are to give cheers, let us cheer the people who have done the fighting.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it is necessary to state the reason why I am going to support the amendment. I will support it, not because I think it is the best thing to be done in order to secure what the statesmen of England and Ireland are trying to secure for Ireland, but because it is the only thing open for us to do, after we have passed the resolution. This amendment is not in accordance with the dignity of the House, after having given expression to the opinions we have expressed, as to what the feelings and sentiments of this Parliament are upon the great question which is agitating our friends on the other side, but as this House, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman, has chosen to refuse to send the resolution to Mr. Gladstone and to refuse to send the address to Her Majesty, as, while endorsing the sentiment he refuses to countenance its transmission, the proposition to send the resolution of the House to Mr. Parnell will receive my support. . . .

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not presume to go in advance of Mr. Parnell, but I am willing this House should convey, in the speediest manner possible, to Mr. Gladstone, to the leader of the Opposition, and to Mr. Parnell, the hero of the struggle, the message stating what has taken place.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot support the amendment to send this resolution, the expression of this House in favour of some measure of Home Rule, to the gentleman who said that he never would have taken off his coat to go to this work had he not expected by so doing to sever the last link between Ireland and England. So far as the other proposition is concerned, since Mr. Gladstone has told us in the most explicit manner to mind our own business, I will not support the proposal now made to send a resolution of sympathy to him when he feels himself in some difficulty.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). By the action of the House to-night—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have kept very

quiet and have interfered with no one, and I am only going to speak for a few moments. It looks, by the action of the House to-night, as if the people of Canada were unanimously in favour of Home Rule. I say it is not so. I say there are a large number of people in Canada who are not in favour of Home Rule. A large number of the Irish people are not favourable to Home Rule. Many gentlemen have said to-night that they come from Ireland. Well, I think I know a little about Ireland, and I contend that the people of Ireland as they are governed to-day, will be more contented than they will after they get Home Rule, if they do get it. I am opposed to this House interfering directly or indirectly with the British people. Let them pass their own laws without any interference from us. *I am opposed to every motion made, and shall vote against every motion made, no matter from which side of the House it comes.*

Mr. CASEY. I think the remarks of the leader of the House on this proposition were particularly unfortunate. They will be regarded by everybody in this country as indicating that the hon. gentleman preferred to risk the utility of the resolution which we are about to pass, to risk its having no effect at all rather than to appear to add anything to the strength of a party leader who is opposed to him in politics.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not intend to notice the speech of the hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), or his remarks respecting myself. I have heard a good deal from him before, and have treated it in the same way as I do now, with contemptuous silence. The reason why I shortly objected to sending the resolution to Mr. Gladstone was that the whole of these resolutions, not only the resolution which was carried, but the original resolution moved by the hon. gentleman opposite, the amendment of my hon. friend, and the amendment to the amendment, will be sent by cable to England and known everywhere in England, by Mr. Gladstone, by Mr. Parnell, and by the leaders of the Opposition in both Houses, to-morrow. Therefore it would avoid the appearance of in fact sending an address to Mr. Gladstone instead of to Her Majesty. The information will go to England, it will have its effect in in England completely and fully, and it will not have its full effect unless all the resolutions voted this evening should be sent at the same time. I have no objection that a resolution should be adopted and added that

this resolution and the other resolutions on the same question voted upon shall be transmitted to the three gentlemen mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not just now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Coughlin.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lost.

Mr. BLAKE. Yeas and Nays.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I will withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot withdraw it.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Coughlin):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barnard,	Jenkins,
Burns,	Macdonald (King's),
Cameron (Inverness)	Mackintosh,
Coughlin,	McGreevy,
Curran,	Massue,
Fortin,	Mitchell,
Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Guilbault,	Royal,
Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Hurteau,	Tassé—22.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dupont,
Allison,	Everett,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,
Auger,	Farrow,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),
Baker (Victoria),	Fisher,
Barker,	Forbes,
Beaty,	Foster,
Bécharde,	Gigault,
Bell,	Gillmor,
Benoit,	Glen,
Bergeron,	Gordon,
Bernier,	Guay,
Blake,	Guillet,
Blondeau,	Gunn,
Bourassa,	Haggart,
Bourbeau,	Hall,
Bowell,	Harley,
Bryson,	Hay,
Burnham,	Hesson,
Burpee,	Hickey,
Cameron (Huron)	Hilliard,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Homer,
Campbell (Victoria),	Innes,
Carling,	Irvine,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jackson,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Jamieson,
Casey,	Kaulbach,
Casgrain,	Kilvert,
Cimon,	King,
Cochrane,	Kirk,
Cook,	Kranz,
Costigan,	Landerkin,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Kent),
Daly,	Landry (Montgomery),
Davies,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Dundas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),

Messieurs

McCallum,	Springer,
McCarthy,	Sproule,
McDougall (Cape Breton),	Stairs,
McIntyre,	Sutherland (Oxford),
McLelan,	Taschereau,
McMullen,	Taylor,
McNeill,	Temple,
Mills,	Thompson,
Moffat,	Townshend,
Mulock,	Trow,
O'Brien,	Trupper,
Orton,	Tyrwhitt,
Onimet,	Vail,
Paint,	Valin,
Paterson (Brant),	Vanasse,
Platt,	Wallace (Albert),
Pruyn,	Wallace (York),
Ray,	Ward,
Reid,	Watson,
Rinfret,	Weldon,
Riopel,	White (Cardwell),
Robertson (Hamilton),	White (Hastings),
Robertson (Hastings),	White (Renfrew),
Rykert,	Wigle,
Scott,	Wilson,
Scriver,	Wood (Brockville),
Small,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Somerville (Brant),	Yeo.—141.
Somerville (Bruce),	

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned a little while ago that I would propose certain amendments, but it has been suggested to me, in order to avoid the appearance of partisanship, that I had better substitute the following motion; I therefore beg leave to move:

That all the words after the word "following" be struck out, and the following be inserted; "And that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Speaker to the Speaker of the House of Commons in England."

Mr. BLAKE. This is another way of making the House speak with a dumb voice. This question arose with reference to the proper form of action in another assembly, an enquiry was made, and the result of the enquiry was that the Speaker of the House of Commons in England, was deemed to have no authority to communicate to the House resolutions so transmitted to him. You, Sir, in the Chair, I think, will confirm that statement, so that if my motion is amended, as the hon. gentleman proposes, he will have accomplished his object. His object is to get rid of any communication across the water. He so stated. He said: We don't want to communicate. He then suggested that we should communicate to the Marquis of Salisbury the defeated motion, after he had found difficulty in the first place. Now he proposes we should communicate it to the person who will have no authority to communicate it to the House of Commons of England at all. It is an ingenious device to accomplish the objects of nullifying, as far as

possible, the feeble effects of the resolution. I hope the House will not adopt that device, and I ask you to say whether I am not correct in that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker has no power or authority to communicate it to the House. A communication like this was sent to me from the British Columbia Legislature, and I simply sent it to the Prime Minister as a private communication.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the Speaker of the House of Commons in England will take the same course you did. He will take steps to give it full publicity in England.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should he not send it to Mr. Gladstone directly?

Mr. MITCHELL. It looks very much like an attempt to burk the expression of opinion in this House. It is not only likely to result in the failure of the object of this discussion, but it will bring discredit and disgrace on the Parliament of Canada.

* * * * *

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish there may be no misunderstanding about this. I stated, before the hon. gentleman moved to add some words to the resolution, that I was willing that we should take such steps as would secure the intelligence of the action of this House being placed before the persons most interested. The hon. gentleman moved that it be sent to Mr. Gladstone, and, my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr Coughlin) was anxious that Mr. Parnell should also be communicated with. I stated then that I thought we might solve the difficulty by communicating it to the three leaders in the House of Commons, so that there may not be any party significance given to it, and I state now that if the channel which the right hon. gentleman has indicated, that is the Speaker of the House of Commons, is one that will, without doubt, answer the purpose, I am willing to accept it. But you, Mr Speaker, indicate that there is a doubt, and that it might not reach the House of Commons through the Speaker, I do not want any doubt about it.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, the hon. gentleman need not say "hear, hear." The House of Commons having pronounced upon this question, there ought to be no bickering about the final steps to be taken now. I am willing to adopt any reasonable mode by which we can place this resolution before the people and Parliament of Great Britain, so that Mr. Gladstone shall have an oppor-

tunity of knowing what we have done, and that the leader of the English Opposition may also know, as well as Mr. Parnell. Mr. Speaker has questioned the competence of the House of Commons in England to communicate any message except through this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you had better persuade your leader to withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me the uneasiness manifested as to this resolution being known by those interested in this question is altogether misplaced. The House knows from the passage I read in the English *Hansard* this evening that on 1st May, 1882, before any official communication had reached Mr. Gladstone or the Colonial Office in London the proceedings of this House had not only appeared in the London *Times* but had been read in Mr. Gladstone's presence in the House of Commons. I undertake to say that before the news can be officially communicated by the officers of this House the proceedings of this afternoon will not only be published in London, but will be known to every member of the House of Commons, and therefore, the question of how we shall officially communicate is not one of essential importance as regards the contents of the resolution, but one in regard to which we may fairly consult our dignity by having the Speaker of this House communicate with the Speaker of the British House of Commons.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman like other hon. gentlemen opposite this evening has declared that we do not want to communicate this resolution to anyone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen and also the First Minister have declared that on account of the dispatch of Earl Kimberley it would be beneath the dignity of the House to communicate with Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman is afraid of sacrificing the dignity of Parliament by communicating anything to the Queen, and so when it was proposed to communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister of England the Prime Minister of this country said we will not communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister, and he proposes to communicate it, to whom? To the Speaker, who cannot make known the communication officially to anyone. Hon. gentlemen object to communicate with the Prime Minister because it is beneath the dignity of the House to communicate with him. That is the only reason given. While hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to have a communication sent

direct to the Prime Minister they wish to save our dignity by having the Speaker of the British House of Commons, after receiving the communication, communicate it to the Prime Minister if he chooses. Of course the hon. gentleman is proceeding on the assumption that he will choose to do so. That is the way the hon. gentleman proposes to get out of the difficulty, and I am sure the hon. gentleman's followers must be very highly pleased indeed with the demonstration made on this question this evening.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It seems to me that this matter is really becoming a burlesque. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen wish to make it such, but I desire if possible to bring the House back to a sense of its own dignity. It seems to me it is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of this House that it should condescend to send any resolution it may pass to any individual or in any other way than by the usual and constitutional usage. It is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of the House that we should pass a resolution and add a rider that it should be sent to Tom, Dick or Harry.

Mr. BLAKE. His name is William Ewart.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Whether it is to Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Parnell or anybody else, so far as this Parliament are concerned they are Tom, Dick and Harry. We are degrading ourselves and losing sight of our dignity by sending that resolution to anyone or communicating anything except in a proper and constitutional manner. I trust any resolution communicating what we have done to-day will not be sent to anyone.

Mr. BLAKE. Let us expunge the resolution then.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). For all practical purposes I think the resolution might be expunged. In other words, the whole thing is buncomb. I think the leader of the Opposition in moving the resolution moved it as a buncomb resolution for the purpose of catching or strengthening his hold on the Irish Catholic people of Ontario, and the whole discussion from beginning to end has been conducted with that view, possibly by both sides of the House. I have no hesitation in saying so. It is all buncomb.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is in order for an hon. member to refer to a resolution of the House in that way.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not understand the resolution was yet passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman voted for it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If it is unparliamentary to declare that what the House has done is buncomb, I withdraw the expression. I have no desire to offend against the rules of the House even by telling what every hon. member knows is the solemn truth. We know the discussion is conducted with this point in view, and that the leader of the Opposition who has expressed strong sympathy with his fellow Irishmen on moving this motion had an ulterior object in view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have not finished my sentence. I was going to say that the hon. gentleman had an ulterior object in view of increasing that popularity in which the Irishmen of the country esteem him. I think that is parliamentary. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the principal reason why my friend brought forward this motion and raised the discussion to-night has been a desire and expectation that the Irish Catholic vote will be influenced by this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said that before.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman says I said that before. I think the hon. gentleman's observation and his votes too have been very largely influenced by the fact that there is a large Irish element in his constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). To come back in all seriousness as to the right or propriety of transmitting the proceedings of this House to any other than a duly constituted assembly, or to Her Majesty, and that we should condescend to send them to individuals, even if they happened to be the leader of the British Government, or the leader of the Irish party.

Mr. MITCHELL. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The public effect of the announcement, if it is deserving of any, will be given for what it is worth, and I think it is better to let the matter rest there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion. Amendment to the amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. I beg leave to move in amendment to the amendment to add the name of Charles Stuart Parnell, M.P.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest, inasmuch as hon. gentlemen opposite have not been willing to accede to the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue that the resolu-

tion should be communicated to the leaders of the various parties in the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. THOMPSON. I say that hon. gentlemen have manifested an unwillingness to do that, and there is no use in hon. gentlemen signifying their dissent. I will suggest as a motion, I will move in the event of this not being carried, that the resolutions be communicated to the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. BLAKE. After that statement, and the reason for it, I will state why I could not give my assent to this resolution being sent by the Parliament of Canada to the Marquis of Salisbury. The reason is that the Marquis of Salisbury is himself a bitter opponent of Home Rule in Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. Not in the House of Commons, and I suppose the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons entertains the views of the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. On the 15th of April the Marquis of Salisbury expressed his views on this question, and he said:

"Home Rule, which a year ago was a chimera, has suddenly become a burning question. It needs no apology from us if, in presence of so great a calamity threatening our nation, we put aside all minor differences and join hands to defend that which is equally precious to us all."

A little later he said:

"Now this is, I hope, the commencement of a great many meetings which will take place in various parts of England. I hope, in the first instance, that these meetings will rouse up the people to study and appreciate the terrible gravity of the problem placed before them, and to resist the tremendous change in the constitution of their country. But I hope that such meetings will rouse them to do something."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the view of the hon. member for Hastings.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is the reason he would like to have the resolution sent to the Marquis of Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. The Marquis of Salisbury said further:

"My belief is that the future Government of Ireland does not involve any such unmanageable difficulty, for the people of this country will be true to the Empire to which they belong. (Loud cheers). We want a wise, firm, continuous administration of the law. (Cheers.) But you must support it, or it will not take place. We want a steady policy—that no considerations of weariness or difficulty at Westminster, that no considerations attaching to the manifold ties of party government under which we

ave, shall drive aside from its strong course the policy upon which the people of England have decided. It is not enough for them to decide it. They must watch over it when it is decided; they must, by their constant and steady support, by the overwhelming force of their will, sweep away this body of resistance which has hitherto, at Westminster, prevented anything like a steady, or constant, or wholesome policy for Ireland (cheers); for this matter, believe me, does not concern Ireland alone. There is a great responsibility upon you, and it will be a terrible thing if, through your weakness, the Irish people are abandoned to the anarchy under which assuredly they will fall. But there is something more which you, as owners of a vast Empire extending to the ends of the earth, must consider before you take this fatal step downwards to which your rulers are inviting you now. There has been a great contest between England and the discontented portions of the Irish people. It is a contest that has lasted through many generations past, through many vicissitudes, and now you are asked to submit to a measure which is placed before you, and to end the contest by a complete and ignominious surrender."

Again he said :

"Your course is watched all over the world; if you consent to this great capitulation; if you mark it with these last signs of disgrace, that you abandoned those whom you induced to fight for you; if, like the Russian traveller, you lighten your sledge for your own fight by throwing out your defenders to the wolves, believe me that it will not be a mere sentimental punishment that you will suffer. Your enemies in every part of the world will be looking on what you do with exultation. Your friends, your supporters, your partisans, will view it with shame, with confusion and with dismay, in every quarter of the globe."

And the Minister of Inland Revenue proposes that we should send the resolution to the Marquis of Salisbury.

* * * * *

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am opposed to sending any address to Mr. Parnell, and I shall vote against it no matter in what shape or form it may come up. I think I can give a very good reason for so doing by reading an extract from Mr. Gladstone's opinion about Mr. Parnell and his dealings with the Home Rule question given not long since. He said :

"Mr. Parnell has never uttered one word of disapproval or misgiving about the assassination literature of America, maintained by a knot of Irishmen who are not ashamed to point out how the ships of Her Majesty's navy ought to be blown into the air, and how gentlemen that they are pleased to select ought to be made the object of the knife of the assassin. You know that there have been some attempts of that kind made in this country. You have heard of the explosion of dynamite in Salford. Mr. Parnell said that occurrence appeared to him to bear the character of a practical joke."

I certainly shall not, sitting here in my place in this Parliament, vote to send a resolution

to Mr. Parnell, who has thus been characterised, and I believe truly characterised, by Mr. Gladstone, for reasons now apparent to us all. I would also refuse to send it to Mr. Gladstone for this reason. I think our sending it to him would be, as the leader of the Opposition desired by his resolution, an approval of the measure submitted by Mr. Gladstone for the consideration of the Imperial Parliament. While I am in favour of a fair and reasonable scheme of Home Rule, which will secure the rights of the minority as well as the majority of the people of Ireland, I am not in favour, and I do not believe the majority of the people of Canada are in favour, of handing the minority over to the majority, and bringing about a worse state of things than existed before. I do not believe Mr. Gladstone's Bill is one that will be accepted by the people of Ireland. I believe it is accepted merely as a step in the direction of separation by the people who are advocating separation. I have good proof of that. I will read an extract from T. P. O'Connor's letter to the *London Times*, in which he speaks in very distinct terms of the measure Mr. Gladstone has presented to Parliament. He says :

"To tax Ireland for Imperial purposes and give Ireland no voice in Imperial affairs——"

That is the proposition in Mr. Gladstone's measure.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is changed.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Pardon me, it is not changed. The only change is the dropping of the Land Bill, but this has not been changed, and there will not be any change in so vital a principle of Mr. Gladstone's measure :—

"would be taxation without representation in a very aggravated form, and would be calculated to make the Empire odious instead of dear to the Irish people."

That is the measure now submitted, and that is the measure which Mr. Parnell has accepted as an instalment; but I think we all know that it is accepted with the view of carrying out the scheme Mr. Parnell has pursued for years, and has never attempted to deny; that is, the separation of Ireland and the dismemberment of the Empire. For these reasons I am opposed to sending this resolution to Mr. Parnell, and I am also opposed to sending it to Mr. Gladstone. I am not willing to go further than the House has gone in approving of a measure of Home Rule which is fair to all classes.

* * * * *

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Allen, Hackett,
Amyot, Harley,
Armstrong, Holton,
Bain (Wentworth), Horteau,
Béchar, Innes,
Bergeron, Irvine,
Blake, Jackson,
Bourassa, King,
Bourbeau, Kirk,
Burns, Landerkin,
Burpee, Macdonald (King's),
Cameron (Huron), McGreevey,
Cameron (Middlesex), McIntyre,
Campbell (Renfrew), McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard), Massue,
Casey, Mills,
Casgrain, Mitchell,
Cook, Moffatt,
Costigan, Mulock,
Coughlin, Paterson (Brant),
Curran, Patterson (Essex),
Daly, Platt,
Davies, Ray,
Dodd, Rinfret,
Dupont, Royal,
Fairbank, Sommerville (Brant),
Fisher, Sommerville (Bruce),
Forbes, Springer,
Gigault, Sutherland (Oxford),
Gillmor, Trow,
Girouard, Vail,
Glen, Watson,
Guay, Weldon,
Guilbault, Wilson.—69.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Allison, Jamieson,
Anger, Jenkins,
Baker (Missisquoi), Kaulback,
Baker (Victoria), Kilvert,
Barker, Kinney,
Barnard, Kranz,
Beaty, Landry (Kent),
Bell, Landry (Montmagny),
Benoit, Langevin (Sir Hector),
Blondeau, Macdonald (Sir John),
Bowell, Mackintosh,
Bryson, Macmaster,
Burnham, Macmillan (Middlesex),
Cameron (Inverness), McCarthy,
Cameron (Victoria), McDougall (C. Breton),
Campbell (Victoria), McLelan,
Carling, McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe), O'Brien,
Chouin, Orton,
Cochrane, Ouimet,
Cuthbert, Paint,
Dawson, Pruyn,
Dickinson, Reid,
Dundas, Riopel,
Everett, Robertson (Hamilton),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), Robertson (Hastings),
Ferguson (Welland), Rykert,
Foster, Scott,
Gordon, Shakespeare,
Grandbois, Small,
Guillet, Sproule,
Haggart, Stairs,
Hill, Tassé,
Hesson, Taylor,
Hickey, Temple,
Hilliard, Thompson,
Homer, Townshend,

Messieurs

Tupper, White (Cardwell),
Tyrwhitt, White (Hastings),
Valin, White (Renfrew),
Vanasse, Wigle,
Wallace (Albert), Wood (Brockville),
Wallace (York), Wood (Westmoreland)—87.
Ward,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMPSON. I made a suggestion a few moments ago as to a channel through which I thought this resolution might be communicated without any objection and without any loss of dignity. Since then it has been suggested that it would be desirable to have a more immediate and public communication on the matter. I therefore beg to move in amendment to substitute these words :

"That the resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Speaker to the High Commissioner for Canada—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, and laughter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am very glad that my motion seems to meet with very good humoured approval by hon. members on the other side of the House; but I am afraid if they will allow me to finish reading it that they will not be so well pleased.

"—for the information of the members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom."

Mr. COOK. For the information of the Minister of Justice I would inform him that the High Commissioner is the gentleman who has no confidence in the breed.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Justice says this is in order to obtain more immediate transmission of the resolution to the parties whom it concerns. Instead of sending it to the First Minister of Great Britain for the information of the House of Commons, he wishes to send it to the High Commissioner of Canada for the information of the British House of Commons. Sir Charles Tupper is a very great man, and in the estimation of the Minister of Justice he is a peculiarly great man. The Minister of Justice owes his position in the Cabinet and many other things to him, but to ask us to believe that Sir Charles Tupper has greater facilities for communicating this resolution to the House of Commons than has the First Minister of England is an absurdity. I believe the Minister of Justice claims to be Irish to some extent. By proposing this motion, he has only shown his capacity for committing a most stupendous Irish bull.

* * * * *

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Justice in behalf of the Government, which a little while ago, declared through the mouth of the leader of the Government that they were opposed to any communication whatever, is now so anxious there should be direct and immediate communication, that he proposes to facilitate the immediate communication which, at the beginning of the discussion, was thought objectionable, by a process which rather seems to be based on the belief in the old proverb that "the longest way round is the shortest way home." The most prompt way of communicating the resolution to the English House of Commons would be to communicate it to the leader of that House, but the hon. gentleman thinks he will get nearer and quicker to the House by communicating to Sir Charles Tupper who has not yet obtained a seat in that body, which some newspapers declared he was seeking. How, then, is he going to communicate it to the members of the House? By issuing circular letters, each containing a copy of the despatch, to the members, so that each member will find it in his box at the post office? Is that the way each individual member is to receive our communication from the High Commissioner? This is only another proof of the secret feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If this is to be cabled to the High Commissioner, let it be made "collect."

House divided on motion of Mr. Thompson.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Allison,
Baker (Missisquoi),
Barnard,
Beaty,
Benoit,
Blondeau,
Bowell,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cameron (Inverness),
Campbell (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Dawson,
Dickinson,
Dundas,
Everett,
Ferguson (Welland),
Fortin,
Foster,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
H
Hesson,
Hickey,
Homer,
Hurteau,
Jamieson,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kinney,
Kranz,
Landry (Montmagny),
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Sir John),
Mackintosh,
Macmaster,
Macmillan (Middlesex),
McCarthy,
McDougall (C. Breton),
McLelan,
McNeill,
Moffat,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Orton,
Oulmet,
Paint,
Pruyn,
Reid,
Riopel,

Robertson (Hamilton),
Robertson (Hastings),
Royal,
Scott,
Shakespeare,
Small,
Stairs,
Tassé,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson.

Messieurs

Townshend,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wallace (Albert),
Ward,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wigle,
Wood (Brockville)—80.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Allen,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Auger,
Bain (Wentworth),
Baker (Victoria),
Barker,
Béchar, d,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Burns,
Burpee,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Cook,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Davies,
Dodd,
Dupont,
Fairbank,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Fisher,
Forbes,
Gigault,
Gilmor,
Girouard,
Glen,
Guay,
Guilbault,
Gunn,
Harley,
Hilliard,
Holton,
Innes,
Irvine,
Jackson,
Jenkins,
King,
Landerkin,
McIntyre,
McMullen,
Mills,
Mitchell,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Essex),
Platt,
Ray,
Rinfret,
Rykert,
Somerville (Brant),
Somerville (Bruce),
Springer,
Sproule,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Trow,
Vail,
Wallace (York),
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Hastings),
Wilson,
Wood (Westmoreland)—70.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Costigan, as amended :

YEAS :
Messieurs

Allen,
Allison,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Auger,
Bain (Wentworth),
Baker (Missisquoi),
Barker,
Barnard,
Beaty,
Béchar, d,
Bell,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Blake,
Blondeau,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Burns,
Burpee,
Cameron (Huron),
Cameron (Inverness),
Cameron (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),
Carling,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Cochrane,
Cook,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Curran,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Davies,
Dawson,
Dickinson,
Dodd,

Messieurs

Dundas,
 Dupont,
 Everett,
 Fairbank,
 Ferguson (Welland),
 Fisher,
 Fortin,
 Foster,
 Gigault,
 Gilmor,
 Glen,
 Gordon,
 Grandbois,
 Guay,
 Guillet,
 Gunn,
 Hackett,
 Haggart,
 Harley,
 Hesson,
 Hickey,
 Hilliard,
 Holton,
 Homer,
 Hurteau,
 Innes,
 Irvine,
 Jackson,
 Jamieson,
 Jenkins,
 Kaulbach,
 Kilvert,
 King,
 Kinney,
 Kirk,
 Kranz,
 Landerkin,
 Landry (Kent),
 Landry (Montmagny),
 Langevin (Sir Hector),
 Macdonald (King's),
 Macdonald (Sir John),
 Mackintosh,
 Macmaster,
 Macmillan (Middlesex),
 McCarthy,
 McDougall (Cap. Breton),
 McIntyre,
 McLelan,
 McMullen,
 McNeill,
 Mills,
 Moffat,
 Montplaisir,
 Mulock,
 O'Brien,
 Orton,
 Paint,
 Paterson (Brant),
 Patterson (Essex),
 Platt,
 Pruyn,
 Ray,
 Reid,
 Rinfret,
 Riopel,
 Robertson (Hamilton),
 Robertson (Hastings),
 Royal,
 Scott,
 Shakespeare,
 Small,
 Sommerville (Brant),
 Sommerville (Bruce),
 Springer,
 Sproule,
 Stairs,
 Tassé,
 Taylor,
 Temple,

Messieurs

Thompson,
 Townshend,
 Trow,
 Tupper,
 Tyrwhitt,
 Vail,
 Valin,
 Vanasse,
 Wallace (Albert),
 Wallace (York),
 Ward,
 Watson,
 Weldon,
 White (Cardwell),
 White (Renfrew),
 Wigle,
 Wilson,
 Wood (Brockville)—140.

NATS :

Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),
 Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
 Fortes,
 Mitchell,
 Rykert,
 White (Hastings)—6.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is well now that we should know what course is to be taken by the High Commissioner in London when he receives this document.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the chair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is rather too late to discuss the subject now, but I think the Government ought to give the matter their serious attention, and direct the Commissioner how he will communicate it to the members of Parliament.

Motion for adjournment agreed to; and the House adjourned at 4:30 a.m. (Friday).